4.

SAMARITANISM

OR, A

TREATISE

OF

Comprehending, Compounding, and *Tolerating*

SEVERAL

RELIGIONS

IN ONE

CHURCH,

DEMONSTRATING,

The Equity and Neceſſity of the Act, and Late Vote of Parliament againſt *Non-conformiſts*. From Reaſon, the Ancient Church, and the Opinions, and Practice of *Papiſts*, and *Puritans*, now Plotting, and Pleading for *Toleration*.

LONDON

Printed for *Robert Clavel*, and are to be ſold by *Henry Broome*, in Little *Brittain* and *Weſtminſter-Hall*

1663?

Of Liberty of Religion.

CHAP I.

A Preparative Enquiry into the Nature of Human Eccleſiaſtical Societies, in general.

MAN being a Sociable Creature, according to the Obſervation of the Philoſopher, and Common Experience; That Human Societies ought to excell Herds and flocks of Cattel, is moſt reaſonable to conclude. For, a Multitude is one thing, and a Society another; and differ as much as a *Common*, and a *Commonwealth*. Yet, as ſuch is the ſagacity and ſubtilty of ſome Animals as that witty Philoſophers have had enough to do to diſtinguiſh the ſupream acts of ſome Beaſts from the reaſonable actions of Men; ſo have ſome acute Obſervers of the nature and order of certain Animals in community, diſcovered ſo much *Decorum* and perfection that they have entitled meerly ſenſitive Creatures to the dignity of Human Societies: and do eſpy a ſemblance of Monarchy in the Regiment of Bees, and Popular Government in that of Ants. But the definition which *Bodin* gives of a Commonwealth, doth ſufficiently put a difference between them, which is this. Bodinus de Rep. lib. 1. init. *Reſpublica eſt Familiarum rerumq; inter ipſas communium ſummâ poteſtate ac ratione moderata multitudo.*

A Commonwealth is a multitude of Families and Common Matter administred by a Supream Power and Reason: For what ever we may judg, there is in some brutish Communities a Supream Command; and that is founded on Sense and natural Instinct: And in Human Societies there is, and of necessity must be, a Supream Authority founded on Reason and Natural Instinct. For as Common Sense proceedeth from Natural Instinct given to Beasts; so Reason proceedeth from, or is the Natural Instinct in Man: The Supream act in Man being termed Reason; and the highest in Beasts, Sense. Though I confess the matter remains very difficult still, to distinguish clearly the one from the other; not in a definition (for that is easie enough to frame) but in the exercise of Acts, whether they belong to, or may be comprehended in the definition of Reason or no? Let others strain their Wits to that purpose; our present Subject calls us another way. And in the first place to note freely the prety, pitiful, and fine presumptions of divers enquirers into the grounds and occasions of Human Societies; which because, forsooth, taken from Reason at first, some Men have imagined that Natural Instinct in Man was not principal in the Constitution of Commonwealths. Some therefore have wittily (at least as they suppose) said, That necessity was the cause why men combined together in one: Necessity of heat drove divers straggling Men to the same fire; and meeting there, they took up several Discourses and Counsels for their common Welfare. Others more seriously, if not more wisely, are of opinion, That self-defence and preservation against common Adversaries impelled many persons to associate together, and to elect some principal Defender of their Persons, and Directer of their Affairs. But they consider not, nor give any account how such Enemies to some, came first to conspire into such a powerful Society, as to be able to offend others. Was this occasioned likewise from fear of others? If so, I will demand perpetually, How came those others so together? And at length it must of necessity be answered, From some other cause, & that cause must be at length, Natural Reason, Justice, and Law; whereby, according to Man, some were obliged to Subjection, as some had right of Dominion. Now what manner of Dominion that was, I leave to be inquired into.

Yet

Yet withal I cannot but smile a little at the boldness, and vain presumption of such who passing over the most visible original of Government, and what *de facto* it first was, (which certainly in all reason must needs be the most natural way of making out the truth) do betake themselves to the uncertain mazes and labyrinths of human imagination, which we find to be swayed and bribed to argue and conclude according to Self-interest, and particular cases of their own. Thus we read the Assertors of the *German* Empire to strain their Reasons to prove the Constitution of that Government according to the famous Golden Bull of *Charles* the Fourth, Emperor, to be most perfect, and natural. But Experience sheweth us plainly, that nothing hath divided, and consequently weaken'd, more that once most potent and flourishing Nation, than those Immunities and Laws have; and render'd the Supream Power so uncertain and obscure, that 'tis an hard matter to find where it is seated; or, if so, to find that to be a Monarchy, and not a Commonwealth, or at least a Combination of Monarchies and Commonwealths.

The like course hath *Contarenus* taken in his description of the State of *Venice*, (for that too must be held to be most natural) bending his Wits to draw the Law and course of Nature to a conformity to his reason, and his reason to the condition of that Commonwealth.

The same course hath *Bellarmine* (and other, especially Jesuitical Authors of the Church of *Rome*) followed in his Previous Controversies to his Disputations of the Power, and Regiment of the Pope, contending hard, that the Government is most Reasonable and Christian, which suits best with the Actual Power of the *Roman* Bishop and Clergy. And some have proceeded to that degree of admiration of that Form, that they have ventured to affirm, That Christ had not done wisely, if he had not ordained and disposed matters just as they now stand among them. And are not there to be found amongst us, who have delivered the very same expressions in behalf of the Presbytery?

And this eying of instances rather than following the clue of his own most rational Wit was that which caused the Philosopher *Aristotle* to be so inconstant to himself in his Politicks. For

when he handled the caſe abſtractly, he judged excellently of the true nature of Government, and the moſt natural Government. But then, having before his eyes what great offence he muſt neceſſarily give to his Country of *Greece*, which abounded with ſeveral Polities of a ſtrange nature; he found it requiſite to ſtrain his Leather to their Laſts. Eſpecially conſidering, that if thoſe Nations, who were for Wit and Learning, the moſt eminent of all the World, ſhould diſreliſh his Schemes (as in all probability they would, as they diſagreed from their plat-forms) it might prove an incurable prejudice to his Works. For, as it is ſeen in Religion, it happens in Civil Polities too, that the more it is with acuteneſs and ſubtilty penetrated, and diſcuſſed, the more corrupt and degenerate it is in the uſe and practice.

For that there is a Government of Divine appointment, as well in Secular as Religious Societies, is not to be much doubted of; and that all *in ſpecie* cannot be ſuch, is evident from the variety and contrariety of them: For the voice of God is either that innate direction, and natural, and indeliberate election and inclination to which Men by a tacite univerſal conſent do tend, and plainly is to one kind of Political Government only, and not indifferently to any, as by inſtances may be given from all people, whoſe firſt Governors were always Monarchs without exception. For that after a State hath for a long time been founded and ſelted, Men out of ſeveral regards and motives ſet their Wits on work, and changed the ſame, not to that Form which really was beſt but beſt pleaſed them, cannot prejudice the title it hath to be Divine and Natural: for as much as we ſee that nothing is ſo natural or indiſputably divine, but it may be, and hath been altered, and thwarted by the bold and unquiet Wits of Men; and no where are ſuch alterations oftner to be found than where Wit and Learning moſt flouriſh; for from an opinion theſe breed in men, are they tempted to deſpiſe the ſimplicity, and direct path of Natural reaſon to ſeek more fine and curious ways of adminiſtring the common Intereſt; Or, the voice of God is that Scriptural word of God which gives neither precedent nor rule, nor precept for above one Government in either of the Polities.

Some ſuppoſe to moderate and compound the matter by affirming, that Government in general is of Divine Inſtitution but

God

God hath left it to the liberty of Men to make choice of one Species or kind of Government, according as it ſhall ſute beſt with the Genius and Humours of the people to be governed. But againſt this I have more to object than may be proper for this occaſion. I ſhall therefore demand firſt, By what Rules of Reaſon, or Philoſophy ſuch Men proceed? for, hitherto in other things it was never heard of that God ſhould poſitively create or ordain a thing in the Genus or Species, and ſo that the *Individuum* under them ſhould take its being and ſubſiſt; when as, what ever Being is in the Genus or Kind is owing to the Particular ſubſiſting by it ſelf. For more plainneſs: Can we ſay, that God firſt made a living Creature in general, and from thence ſprang Man and Beaſt? or an Horſe, and *Socrates*? Did he not rather firſt of all create this Man in particular, and ſo Human Nature had its original ſpecifical; and firſt create this Individual Beaſt, and ſo from thence that nature of Animals take its denomination and being. And thus was it in the Inſtitution of Governments. God cannot rationally nor truly be ſaid to make Government in general, or ordain it, and not firſt inſtitute ſome one particular Government, from whence the like might be termed Divine, and the Species it ſelf ſuch.

Conſider we farther, how more than ridiculous it were that Divine Inſtitution ſhould be of ſuch immenſe extent and capacity, as that it were impoſſible for the boldeſt and wildeſt wit of Man to invent ſuch a form as ſhould not be divine? Which muſt of neceſſity follow, or the quite contrary, that no Government is of divine appointment *in ſpecie*; both which are equally and utterly falſe and abſurd. The former, in that it makes Divine Right like the fabulous fiction of Poets concerning Victory between two Armies engaging, hanging in the Air, and hovering over mens heads, until the main ſtroke be ſtruck, and Men have voted eſpecially for one ſort of Government, and then forthwith down comes Divine Right amain, and lighting on it makes it undoubtedly Divine. And to hold that no Government is of Divine Original, is to deſtroy all Right of Rule; and, as ſome enemies to Mankind have with impudence and ſtupidity (even while they ſeek nothing ſo much as to appear tranſcendent) proportionably to reduce all kinds and actual poſſeſſion of Empire to the

the base principle of Beasts, strength and force; and his it is, as well in Justice as Act, who can catch it. Such a Philosopher indeed as this (and, as Reason and Religion now goes, such an one is no small fool amongst us) deserves to have the edge of his acute wit turned against him, and to be disputed with, as Men are wont to do with his fellow beasts destructive to Mankind, with a Kennel of hounds, spears, and staffs.

But I return to demand further, Whether that Charter is extant, to whom it properly and by divine intention pertains, that Men may chose what Government they please? That which God would have is sufficiently made known unto us from the nature and form of that which by his special Providence first, and only appeared for hundreds of years in the World. Those which succeeded and excluded the Primitive, were the effect of passions principally: But no sooner had Lust, Interest, and Error caused men to introduce their own devices, but instantly Nature and Scripture were drawn to assert and sustain them; as Bastards left in distress and helpless, are put to honest Women to Nurse and bring up.

I know very well, and readily grant that all sorts of Governments have somewhat Divine in them; but this they have not as several sorts, nor as such Forms, but in respect of the matter they are concerned in, which principally is that truly Divine Law, Justice; which as to the matter of it, may as really, though not so regularly, be administred in one kind, as another.

But he that would faithfully and successively settle his judgment in the true and genuine kind of Government, whether Ecclesiastical or Civil, ought not to proceed in that long, tedious, and most uncertain way of Mens minds and Interests, of enquiring, which of all seems most reasonable, most equal, most holy, and beneficial to the ends of all Rule; and conclude that to be so, which seems to their understanding, to be blessed most plentifully with these; but must impartially and sincerely enquire after the *Fact* immediately; which of all these have the fairest and clearest proofs of being *de facto* instituted of God. For, a quite contrary method may be observed in the Will and Laws of Men, and of God: Man choseth and decrees a thing because it is good and laudable; but on the contrary, because God wills and ordains a thing, therefore is it good of necessity; according as *Gerson* hath excellently observed,

Deus

Deus non ideò vult res ad extra fieri quia bonæ ſunt, quemadmodum movetur humana voluntas ex objectione boni, vel veri vel apparentis. Eſt è contra potius, quod ideò res ad extra bonæ ſunt, quia Deus vult eas tales eſſe: Ideóque ſi vellet eas vel non eſſe, vel aliter eſſe, id quoque jam bonum eſſet, &c. Thus he. For inſtance, We all, or moſtly agree, that the Parts of Man's body are placed moſt aptly for uſe and ſervice of the whole, and moſt beautifully for ornament placed in the ſame. Yet ſuppoſing that it had been the will of God to have ſet the Noſe of Man behind him, his Eyes in his Breſt, his Ears on the Crown of his Head, and his Mouth on the Navel of his Belly, without diſpute this had been the moſt wiſe, beautiful, and uſeful order. In like manner, had it ſeemed good to God to caſt Civil and Church-Government into any other ſhape, form, or condition than actually he hath, it were not to be queſtion'd but it would be moſt perfect and excellent. From all which (ending this Chapter) I infer theſe Concluſions as certain and pious: Gerſon de Conſolatione Theologiæ. Prof. 2.

First, That both Polities have a Government eſpecially Divine.

Secondly, I conclude, That Government ſo Divine is not to be altered under ſpecious pretexts, and Human ratiocinations and preſumptions offering themſelves, that another ſort would ſerve the ends of Community better: For the fault may be, and moſt commonly is, in the knottineſs and croſs-grainneſs of the piece of Wood, and not in the Tool, or Artificer. And more reaſonable it is divers times, the People ſhould be changed, than their Laws or Government; though the contrary is commonly ſeen, that when they offend in untractableneſs, they caſt off the accuſation from themſelves, by chaſtiſing the Laws, controverting Titles, and quareling at the imperfections and inconveniences of that Government they live under, as not good enough for them.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

A Second General Preparation to the determining the Queſtion, by removing vulgar miſtakes concerning Tyranny, Antichriſtianiſm, Chriſtian Liberty, Extreams, and Moderation.

IT is too plainly ſeen, that words, which at firſt were inſtituted to ſerve Man's underſtanding, and guide it into the knowledg of things, do command, pervert, and hurry it into many miſtakes and errors: Or perhaps, to ſpeak more properly, the vulgar uſe corrupting them cauſeth this miſchief. And hence it is that an opprobrious name maliciouſly or ignorantly given, and commonly applied is abundantly ſufficient to captivate ordinary Minds into an evil opinion of things undeſervedly. Call therefore a Government Tyrannical, Antichriſtian, Extream, Immoderate, and againſt Chriſtian Liberty; this with the Common ſort, proves ſuch a Government ought not to be endured, though it be not all proved that ſuch terms properly belong to it, nor indeed ſuch perſons who are ſo liberal of their ill language know well what they ſay, or whereof they affirm. Let us endeavour then to come very briefly to a true notion of ſome of them.

Concerning Tyranny then, a grand and current miſtake there is that it is properly a *Species* or kind of Government; which is true indeed if it be taken in the Ancienteſt, not Modern ſenſe, for the ſame with Monarchy, or the Government of One. And thus in truth divers have of late taken it, ſuppoſing that Monarchy and Tyranny are the ſame; and that the Rule of One abſolutely muſt of neceſſity be Tyranny, which is altogether as true as the other extreme they fall into, *viz.* That all Government by many is a Government of Liberty. *Ariſtotle* when he ſaid, That Monarchy eaſily degenerates into Tyranny, did not ſay or mean that it was ſo in its own nature: Neither, did he ſay *Polycratie* did not, nor could fall into the ſame. For he that will be at the ſmall pains to weigh the matter ſincerely, ſhall eaſily perceive that Tyranny is no Government of it ſelf, but the corruption of Government. And Liberty is no more eſſential to

Ariſto-

Aristocracie, or such like Government, Constituted of many Rulers, than to *Monarchy*; and that dreadful thing, called Arbitrary Power, is altogether as incident to the Rule of Many; as when One alone has the Supream Power: Nay, there must of necessity be an Arbitrary Power, and Actually is, in all Commonwealths, as hath been Irrefragably Demonstrated by others already, who are not of the *Clergy*, who are often Censured, for driving matters of this nature too high. For it is impossible any Commonwealth should subsist, or continue without a Supream Absolute Power; and where ever this is, there is that we call Arbitrary Power. Many People indeed, observing the evils of this, have so Framed their Government, and Constituted Governours as to prevent the same; and have allmost infinitely multiplyed Governors, and Inspectors over Governors, and Check over Check, but could never find succes answerable; the last Remedie of all therefore against Courts, Princes, and Greatest Councills, have been to entitle the People in Gross, to take account of such Irregularities: but such a remedy, as it could never so much as take place, for as much as never did, or can the People concurr Universally to such Ends, but the *Major*, or more Active, and busie part carried the name of all, which commonly is a piece of as great injustice, and injury, as any they would cure by such jealous Vigilancy: and if it could be done, Were not this as Arbitrary a Proceeding, as the very First of all?

Anarchie of mixed Monarchy.

Populum autem non omnem cœtum multitudinis, sed cœtum juris consensu & utilitatis communione sociatum esse determinat. Scipio. Ciceronianus *apud* Augustinum *de Civitate Dei.* Lib. 2. cap. 21.

There is therefore, and must be in all Government an Absolute, and Arbitrary Power. Now, that, when this Supremest Power is vested in One, it must presently be called a Tyrannie; when in many, Liberty, is a miserable cheat of the Common-people by ambitious, and discontented persons, seeking the advancement of themselves, by the Oppression of others. For, as the Apostle in another Case hath it; *Thou art inexcusable, O man, whoso ever thou art that judgest, for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thy self, for thou that judgest, dost the same things.* So that if it be unjust for One who is Supream, to do such a thing towards such as are Subject to him, it is unjust for Many so to do; and if it be Tyrannical for Him, it is Tyrannical in Many, even in a *Senate*: For, what is Tyrannie, but an excessive use, or exercise of Power, contrary to the Law of Reason, and Justice:

So that Tyrannie, doth not consist in the abundance of Power, but in the abuse: as other Moral Vices, do not consist in full power to offend, but in the ill use of such Power. For, as Drunkenness consisteth not in having plenty of Wine, nor Gluttonie in having choice and command of rich and various Fare (and so in other things); but in taking too liberally, and inordinately of them: So Tyrannie is not the uncontrollableness of Power in One Person or more, but the unreasonable and immoderate use according to Power. For he indeed is a Tyrant that thus carries himself, and that Council is Tyrannical, yea, that People is Tyrannical, which contrary to the Law of Reason Invadeth, and Mutilateth the Rights of Dominion belonging to their Governours, which may be their Property as justly, and reasonably, as any Goods, or Possessions belonging to Subjects, may be so termed, in respect of them. A thing, which if it were impartially, and conscionably considered, me-thinks People would be more modest, than to think all those Privileges, and Liberties (they can, by flattery, craft, or taking advantage of necessities into which their Governours may be brought, gain to themselves) lawful spoil; or indeed, though at first sight they may appear so, profitable for themselves: For suppose we, that a people studious of Liberty, should not only procure a Law that they should be free from all contributions to common good but what voluntarily they should please to give; but likewise, by such a Law, that they should never be compelled (which we vulgarly, and corruptly call, Pressed) to the Warrs; this surely would seem a glorious Liberty, and benefit to the common sort, but really would in short time prove the ruine of the whole. There is such an Immunity claimed by the Commons of the Confederate *Netherlands*, which hath endangered; and certainly, had not the Governours found out some prettie tricks to elude it, had unavoidably brought those Commonwealths to nothing. St. *Austin* in his Book of the City of God, tells us, That *Scipio* in *Tullie* calls an unjust King a Tyrant; and unjust Nobles, Governing, a Faction; and speaking of the excess of Popular Government, to that, saith he, *Nomen non reperit, nisi ut etiam & ipsum Tyrannum vocaret, i.e.* He could find no name for them, but Tyrants also: Neither have such just excuse, because perhaps they have a Law on their

Auguſt. *De vit. Dei.* Lib. 2. ca. 21.

Θυ γὰρ ὡς ἀνθρωποι νόμους τίθενται, τὸ ἔνλογον ἁπλῶς ἔχουσι καὶ πάντοτε φαινόμενον ἀλλ' ἐνία καὶ δοκεῖ κομιδῆ γελοῖα τῶν προσταγμάτων.

Plutarch. De sera Numinis. & Psal. 94. 20.

their ſide. For the Law it ſelf, may have been extorted; and, if freely Enacted, yet unjuſt in it ſelf, as that we laſt mentioned; and that *Law* of which the *Pſalmiſt* ſpeaketh, *framing miſchief*; and that Law, which many vehemently plead for in Church-Diſcipline, as that wherein conſiſteth (as they fondly, and falſly imagine, or perhaps would ſeem to believe rather) Chriſtian Liberty, That every man ſhould do as he pleaſes, in things ſo Indifferent that they are not under any Precept or Prohibition of Gods Word: For this would inevitably produce differences; and differences, in ſuch inconſiderable matters, will infallibly proceed to Animoſities and Diviſions in greater matters, and there terminate in the overthrow of all Diſcipline, or Government: I ſay, All Diſcipline. Now there is a Diſcipline which Mr. *Beza* held to be a third Eſſential part of a true Church, if we believe Mr. *Cartwright*, relating his opinion or his own: Which is, That matters of Diſcipline, and kind of Government, are not to be diſtinguiſhed from matters neceſſary to Salvation and Faith: So that however they ſeem to be of this deſtructive Opinion (and indeed, they often and plainly affirm ſo much) yet they be no longer of it, than till ſuch time as the Power be in their own hands: juſt as the Miller ſtops the courſe of the Waters, not that he is abſolutely againſt Rivers, what ever he may ſeem to be, but till he ſhall find it neceſſary for his own Griſt. Now to return to the Application of what we have ſaid, concerning Tyranny, which our Church-Government is commonly, and boldly charged with by Sectaries, and particularly, in their Synodical Letters to Tranſmarine Churches; They may learn at Length, that no Government in its Nature is Tyrannical, but the evil Adminiſtration of any Government makes any ſo, though Democratical. For it is not neceſſary, that the *Perſian*, *Turkiſh*, or *Tartarian* Government ſhould be Tyrannical, more than That of *Venice*, or of the *United Provinces*. For theſe have as Abſolute and Arbitrary Dominion as they. 'Tis true, theſe have more Moderate and Favourable Laws of Ruling than They: But who ſhall conſtrain them to obſerve them, if they pleaſe to break them? The People? So may the People bring thoſe Barbarous Kings to more equal dealing, if they can, as well as the other. If therefore Many in Authority, whether Civil or Eccleſiaſtical

Cartwright in Second Reply *p.* 53. *Id.* Firſt Reply. *pa.* 14.

do the same things, and have as much Power as One; the Tyranny of this differs from the Tyranny of them, just as much as a pound of Lead doth from a pound of Feathers; which is no small matter with vulgar Judges. Therefore, until Reformers of Governments deny the power to themselves which they deny to others, and the exercise thereof; let them accustom their mouths to more ingenuous and sincere language, and either forbear to traduce others with that ignominious term, or begin to hallow it by their profession and practice. For 'tis but changing the singular into the plural number, and *Aristotle*'s description of a Tyrant will suit as well with States and Classes, as with King and Bishops: *viz. The Tyrants seek their own good, but Princes seek the good of them they govern*: Wherein he is followed by Saint *Basil*; as is he, by *Isidore Pelusiotes*. But let us proceed to what follows.

Ὁ μὲν τύραννος τὸ ἑαυτῷ συμφέρον σκοπεῖ, ὁ Βασιλεὺς τὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων. *Aristot. Ethic. lib.* 1. *c.* 10. *Basil. M.* in *Princip. Prov. Isido. Pelusiot. lib.* 3. *Epi.* 194. & *lib.* 4. *Epist.* 142.

Next in order, nature, and abuse, is infamous Extremity, immoderateness, or want of moderation, in managing Controversies, and composing and curing Divisions and Differences: For, whoso shall go under such imputations of the Vulgar shall have enough to answer for, though no more be objected against him. Let us see therefore what is Moderation, and consequently Extremities, according to vulgar acception. After this manner then, Moderation is the same in effect with the art of cleaving of Billets, cutting or chopping a thing in the middle, and dividing the live-Child into two equal parts between the unjust pretender, and the true Mother, without any due consideration of the cause it self, in justice, but the peace of different Parties. For as *Plutarch* observeth, Πρὸς ἄνθωπον ἀνοητὸν καὶ φαῦλον, οὐδὲν ἐστι μέτρον οὐσίας. *With Fools and Knaves there is no such thing as the Mean, as to the Thing.* But if Men be extreamly distant from, or opposite to a thing or person, then presently do they accuse the same of Extreams, not considering that it is in the power of any Man to declare & denominate a thing extream, by his only act of extreamly departing from it, as easily as it is in his power by turning himself about, to cause a thing to stand to the left or right hand.

Plutarch. in *Symposiac.*

If

If then to reconcile Matters and come to a Mediocrity, we ſhall think it fit to clap into the middle, and give one of the Diſſenters one part, and another, the other; we ſhall quickly diſpatch and deſtroy all Vertue, all Religion, and all Juſtice, in pretending fairly, and intending foully to conſerve them. But Truth, as *Plutarch* hath wiſely noted, is to be ſought out Διὰ ἀρετῆς ὐ Διὰ τῆς ἐναντίας κακίας, *i.e.* for Vertue's ſake, not for the extream vice: Unleſs therefore Men ſhall firſt agree upon a rule and ſtandard to meaſure opinions and actions, and accuſations, beſides what is famed or defamed for Extream, it is in vain and fooliſh to talk of Moderation or extream. For, had our Anceſtors held only to that kind of trial, and accommodating differences either in State or Church; we had had neither Juſtice, nor Religion, to ſtrive or contend about at preſent; or, at leaſt, that far from the true. For firſt, *Judaiſm* may be ſaid to be a Mean between *Mahometiſm* and *Chriſtianiſm*; *Popery* a Mean between *Judaiſm* and *Socinianiſm*: Again, the *Reformation* a Mean between *Papiſm* and *Socinianiſm*; and the *Engliſh Reformation*, a Mean between *Popery* and *Puritaniſm*: And, if we muſt be forced to farther Moderation ſtill, *Independency* will be found a Mean between *Presbyteriſm* and *Epiſcopal* Government, as *Presbyteriſm* is a Mean between *Epiſcopacy* and *Independency*; and *Independency* a Mean between *Presbytery* and *Anabaptiſm*, and *Anabaptiſm* a Mean between *Independency* and *Quakeriſm*; and ſo on, till the wit of Man ſhall be able to invent no more Extreams; which whether that will ever be, I know not. Now would I demand, (if it were lawful) Which of all theſe is truly eligible for the Mean ſake? and when that ſhall be pitched on and choſen, Upon what account and ground? Muſt it not be rather becauſe of ſome ſpecial Vertue proper to it as coming neerer to that we conſtitute and propound to our ſelves, as a certain Rule and Principle, than for that it ſtands between two Extreams, which is common alſo to that Religion which we reject? For 'tis evident by Antiquity, that by the fair face of Mediocrity the *Arians* under *Conſtantius* the Emperor proſpered to the couſenage of the ſimpler, and overthrow of the wiſer Catholicks. But how well *Hilary* thought of this method of Pacification and quieting ſtirs in the Church, theſe his words to *Conſtantius* plainly teſtifie, *Hæc ille pater tuus hominarum mortium docuit, vincere*

Plutarch. de Adulatore.

Hilarius contra Conſtant.

ſine

ſine contumacia, jugulare ſine gladio, perſequi ſine infamia, odir ſine ſuſpicione, mentiri ſine intelligentia, profiteri ſine fide, blandiri ſine bonitate, agere quod velis, nec manifeſtare quæ velis, i. e. This your Father, the mortal Enemy to man, taught you, to Conquer without Fierceneſs, to Stab without a Sword, to make Profeſſion and yet have no Faith, to flatter without goodneſs, to obtain your will, and yet not to diſcover your will. Thus he. And this certainly and generally do they, who contend for Moderation, after ſo many, and great Inſtances, as may already be given of their condeſcenſions and conceſſions, from whom ſtill boldly and afreſh more Moderation is exacted, as if nothing had been done to ſeek their Peace and good Opinion; whoſe immodeſty and immoderateneſs will not ſuffer them to reſt, ſo long as they have any hope left them to obtain their Ends, under the ſpecious pretext of Moderation: For if what, and as often as, they demand, be granted, upon that account, they muſt of neceſſity, in time (and that not long) exhauſt and quite deſtroy them inſenſibly: If they be not gratified in this, ſo fair and Popular requeſt; then will they ſhrewdly endanger their Reputation and Intereſt, by bringing them under the Odium and Infamy with the Multitude, for Perſons in Extreams, and who will yield nothing for Peace and Unitie's ſake. But for my own particular, I had rather be Robbed than Cheated; and ſuffer the ſame loſs by open violence and aggreſſions, than by fair frauds, by which I muſt believe at the ſame time I am dealt Friendly, and Equally with.

It being then in the Power of any ſingle Perſon, and much more of a Faction, to make a Church, or, more truly, to denominate it, Extream and Immoderate, when ever they pleaſe to run far enough from it, by their roving Inventions and Innovations; When will there be any reſt, or ſtability from ſuch accuſers; if ſuch a Church ſhall preſently be obliged by the Sacred Bonds of Charity, Unity, and Peace, to leave its ground and follow them, at leſt in part, and to relinquiſh its Poſſeſſion and Right, leſt by the foreſaid Engine of ſhew and pretence of Moderation, it be turned out of doors? Surely, God muſt be truſted in ſuch Caſes, if there were no other reaſon (as there are many and weighty) beſides the neceſſity of diſcouraging ſuch Attempts, which would never be wanting, when ſuch ſucceſs is hoped for, upon ſuch general and weak, though plauſible, Pleas. It

It is wont to be said, that all this may be true, for it is not fit all Pretenders and Opinions should be Tolerated, or yielded to; but this makes nothing against the Sober, Godly, and Conscientious Party, who can do somewhat, in order to a Reconciliation; and keep close to the Rule of the Scripture.

I do observe, that the best Arms (even such men have to prevaile with), are, very frequent and large praises of themselves, and profuse self-commendation, which hath had wonderful great success: For if you demand an Argument, and some competent Proof that they are so Conscientious, or how possibly they can be said to be so, who have been so enormous in Sins of a Party, and not Personal Sins; you shall find shameful tergiversation, or more shameful Justification of such Practises, as, in our estimation no Sober, Honest, or truly Conscientious man can be subject to, and much less defend.

And as touching the great Regard, pretended to be had to the Word of God, we see no cause to take them at their Word, or that they should measure, and judge their own Last. It is a stronger and more reasonable Proof, that they have not the Scriptures on their side, than any they can bring that they have, That all indifferent standers by, give it against them: I mean, the Tradition and Practise of the best and ancientest Churches

Neither will the Doctrine of Christian Liberty relieve these; if better understood, than vulgarly it is. For, not to make a set Dispute of that Subject at present, two general Errors may be noted which have evil Influence upon men: First, That Christian Liberty is only Negative, being completed in a freedom from Judaical Servitude, or Bondage under *Moses* his Law; or not doing what was indispensably Imposed by that Law, on that People: and not in any thing Positive, or a Licence to act more than it was free or Lawful for them. Though I do not find that it was by *Moses* his Law, made utterly Unlawful, for that People to Act any thing, besides what was Commanded expressely by it; It is plain, that in process of time they did contrive many things Extrinsecally related to the Worship of God. Neither are such their Ordinances any where reprehended in Scripture; but such are often, which are contrary to their Law, or justle out the orders of God, and his precepts. and these are the places brought so

against

againſt Human Inventions ſubſervient to God's command; very ignorantly, or peeviſhly. But however, Liberty of Chriſtians extendeth as well to the Affirmative as Negative part; that is, to do thoſe things which are not prohibited any ways by God's Word, as well as not to do thoſe things which the *Jews* were bound to do. Hence it follows, that, were it ſo, that the *Jewiſh* Church was tyed up ſo ſtrictly (which I do not believe) that it could not act any thing circumſtantiating the ſervice of God but what was directly required, yet Evangelical Liberty, being as well of a far more ample as noble condition, doth permit ſuch things, contrary to the ſuperſtition of late Paſtors.

Another Miſtake is concerning the proper ſeat or ſubject of Evangelical Liberty. For, divers there are that ſuppoſe that ſuch Liberty we now treat of (for I know there are divers other ſorts of far more excellent nature, but not concerning us at preſent) belongeth immediately and entirely, to each ſingle good Chriſtian; which is far from truth and ſobriety to conceive: For Chriſt gave this Donative primarily and immediately to his Church and the Adminiſtrators thereof; that they, according to Chriſt's Charter, ſhould have liberty to inſtitute, abrogate, order, and diſpoſe matters, ſuch Rites and Obſervances as ſhall ſeem to them moſt conducible to the Faith and Worſhip of God under the Goſpel; yet with ſuch limitations both for number and nature, that none be introduced contrary to the tenor thereof, or Analogy of Faith, or tend to the burying of any integral part or practiſe thereof under ſuch rubbiſh; yet are not preſently all private Chriſtians allowed to preſide over their Superiors, to the determining what is of evil conſequence, and what not, againſt publick judgment: For Inſtance, To have power to determine the eating of Fleſh on Friday or not, is undoubtedly a Liberty Evangelical; but 'tis not immediately poſited in every particular Chriſtian, but the Church Repreſentative; and private perſons have no liberty but as it is diſpenſed by publick Authority. When I call this a Liberty Evangelical, I mean not as too many do, as if ſuch an indifferency muſt properly belong to Chriſtians; for it doth not: For Infidels and Heathen have that liberty as fully as Chriſt's Church; and they in Authority amongſt them may as well grant or deny this Liberty as Chriſtians; and no queſti-

queſtion but ſuch as are ſubject to them ſhould offend if they perverſly refuſed to comply with their Superiors orders. Does therefore, think we, Chriſtian Religion and Liberty exempt us from that kind of obedience which is naturally due? For my part, that I hold a double obligation, rather of Chriſtians to ſubmit; and that I can rather pitty, than help ſuch as are of the contrary Opinion, is all that I ſhall ſay at this time: Yet we ſee that too common amongſt us, which *Calvin* himſelf endeavoured to ſcoff men out of, in theſe Words, *Videas quoſdam quibus ſua libertas non videtur conſiſtere, niſi per eſum carnium die Veneris in ejus poſſeſſionem venerint, i. e.* You may ſee ſome who ſuppoſe their Liberty cannot hold, unleſs they take Poſſeſſion of it, by eating Fleſh on *Fridays*. To conclude then, It is directly repugnant to Chriſtian Liberty to deny, the Church hath power to appoint the uſe, or diſ-uſe of things Indifferent; and 'tis abſolutly inconſiſtent with Evangelical Piety, and the power of Godlineſs (which conſiſt much in denying our own Wills and Appetites) to glory how eaſily we Contemn ſuch Lawful Orders.

Calvin. Inſtitut. *Lib.* 3. *cap.* 9.

I had thought to have ſaid ſomewhat, againſt the bold Charge of Antichriſtianiſm laid to our Church; and a reaſon, why men that cannot Rule us muſt not obey it: But I perceive the Feavour of our late Reformers to be ſomewhat abated, and like men newly come out of Calentures, they begin to come to their ſenſes, to ſee they were monſtrouſly out, though not ſo much to their Reaſon, as to make ſatisfaction for ſuch Phrantick Miſcarriages by a ſober retractation, and diſabuſing of Men, (as in Conſcience they are bound) from that, and ſuch like Extravagancies.

But for Peace-ſake, and to prevent a Schiſm, we ought to condeſcend to our Brethren, who (to uſe their own Phraſe, which they beſt know what it means) can come up to us in many things. But what means this great and ſuddain Change in theſe men? Are not they the very ſame, who formerly made it Criminal, yea Capital to Preach Peace, and propound Reconciliation? Yes ſure, but Times, not Manners are altered. Surely ſomewhat extraordinary is at the bottom of all this. They Act not according to Nature, but outward neceſſity: and ſuch a Peace is not worth the having, which can never be held any longer, than men ſhall be able to break it, or work their ends by Inſinuations and fair

Promiſes; open force failing them. Like as it is ſeen with an impure Aſſailant of Virginity, the party being Reſcued by an extraordinary Providence out of his wicked Hands, he turns to her again, and tempts her to his Luſt by promiſes of Marriage; but having obtained his ends, deſpiſes, whom he hath undone: Or as the Lyon and the mans Daughter, in the *Apologue*: The Lyon ſought the Fathers conſent for his Daughter: Very willingly, ſaid the man, upon condition that you will ſuffer your Claws to be pared cloſe, and your Teeth taken out, leſt you hurt my tender Daughter: The Lyons extream love cauſed him to do ſo; and then demainding his Spouſe, was not only denied her, but, not being able to help himſelf, was knock't 'oth' head for his kind Condeſcentions. When the Church of *England* hath ſpoiled it ſelf of its proper and natural Guards, then will the fair Diſcipline be monſtrouſly kind to it: and the event every man ſees. But what at length do they intend by their ænigmatical ſpeech of Coming up to us? Will they Renounce one branch of their Covenant? Will they for ever lay aſide one of the Cords of their Whip with ſix ſtrings? I have ſeriouſly asked and urged ſome of them, and could not get any laſting Conceſſion, any longer than they ſhall be enabled to exact the whole: And do we admire they ſhould, until that time, ſeem at leaſt ſatisfied with part? Let them name one thing, that for Peace-ſake for theſe Hundred years, they would give to us more than we had before; But very many Relaxations have been make already, and are we awhit the nearer? Or is it not then time to make a ſtop of Diſpenſations; when the Diſpenſation for a time ſhall be alledged againſt the Law, and Canon it ſelf? And it is no kindneſs at all (in their opinions) that ſuch Mitigations and Connivance have been; but Extremity, Tyranny, Injuſtice, Uncharitableneſs, to reſtore the Priſtine force and vigour to Eccleſiaſtical Laws. Upon theſe and the like Conſiderations, I conclude with

Cic. Philip 7. *Tullie* to *Antonie*. *Quæris quare pacem nolo? Quia turpis; Quia periculoſa; Quia eſſe non poteſt.* Would ye know, why I will have no peace? Becauſe it is diſhoneſt, becauſe it is dangerous, and becauſe it cannot be. It muſt needs be diſhoneſt and diſhonourable, becauſe of the conditions required. For they having extreamly ſeparated themſelves from us, and ſtanding at that diſtance firmely,

firmly, do caſt the odious termes of Extreams, upon them they have ſo left; and call their dragging us to them, their coming home to us; and their pulling us down to their pleaſures, their coming up to us. And that it is dangerous, appears from manifold Tenets, interpreted clearly againſt their own temporizing Gloſſes; by their apparently wicked attempts and practiſes: And if there were no more then preſent ambiguous, and two-handl'd Phraſes whereby they Characterize themſelves, and diſtinguiſh themſelves from others, they are much to be ſuſpected. For we often do hear them Magnifying their Capacities and Genius's, as that they are Free-born Subjects; they are a free ſpirited People; a free-born People; and ſuch like: which as they are ſpecial pieces of flatteries to make the common ſort proud of themſelves, ſo truly, we cannot throughly underſtand what they ſignify: but this we know, ſuch Phraſes change like water, in Weather-glaſſes: If it be a fair and clear time with us, than do they fall down low, to a very tolerable ſenſe; but if fowl and troubleſome, then do they riſe to a higher Meaning a great deal, and Actions ſuitable. And what poſſibility of Reconciliation and Peace durable, is to be expected from thoſe men, whom nothing truly will content leſs, than their entire Diſcipline? but if they accept leſs for the preſent, they take it, only as men do debts hard to be got in, in part of payment, until they ſhall be able to recover all. Hear what the above mentioned Pretended Moderator ſaith, and you will begin to ſee, what great hopes, or advantage may be had of them.

John Corbet's Intereſt of England. pag. 24. pag. 57.

The Publick State of theſe Differences is ſuch, that the Prelatiſts may, and ought to deſcend to the Presbyterians in the propoſed Moderate Way; but the Presbyterians cannot come up to the Prelatiſts in the hight of their Way. For the Prelatiſts Condeſcention, ſtands only in the omiſſion of certain things, which ſeem to them laudable; but the Subjection of the Presbyterians ſtands, in Subſcribing, and Conforming to certain things, which ſeem to them unlawful. Thus he. But, according to what Rule does it appear, which is here weakly and childiſhly taken for granted, that the *Prelatiſts* (as this *Jack-ſtraw* miſcalls thoſe of the Church of *England*) are ſo high? Let it be ſhewed, what is the Mean they have ſo far exceeded; and what Laws of Church-Government they

John Corbet's Intereſt. pag. 109.

have, or do Tranſcend? If they make their Interpretations of Scripture, the Law; their Models, the Rule; their Diſcipline, the Mean, we ought to compare, examine and judge our ſelves by; we muſt confeſs we are out; we are in the Extream, we are very high: but who could be ſo bold beſides theſe men, to expect ſuch a fond and abſurd conceſſion? And who ſo ſtupid among us, to yield, to that moſt Ridiculous way of Tryal? when We being the only Legal Viſible Church of this Nation, as to outward Conſtitutions, in all equal Mens reaſon have a Right to judge them, and rather Condemn them of Extream, on the contrary ſide, to which, we neither can, nor ought to deſcend. But it will be ſaid, The Reformed Churches abroad may direct us. Ye are to know, and conſider, That there is not One Reformed Church that We can hear of, that (were it their Caſe, as it is yours) would thus tugg, and ſtand out againſt us: as Mr. *Durel* hath amply ſhewed. Again, Our Church hath no ſuch Obligations, to receive the Sentence of All the Reformed Churches put together; as you have, to ſubmit to Ours, as being generally Educated in, and under the ſame. And Thirdly, I Appeal to all the World, What an unwiſe, and ungodly Charity it would be in us, ſo to condeſcend to your Pitch, and conceptions of Church-Government, and Orders for the gaining of a very uncertain Peace with you, and thereby put our ſelves out of a poſſibility, of having any Communion, or Peace with almoſt infinite Churches abroad; who will receive into Communion and Fellowſhip, none that want ſuch things, as you require us to lay away, for love of you. I ſpeak not ſo much of the *Romiſh Church*, as *Greek* and *Eaſtern Churches*; with whom to hold Communion and Peace, by retaining ſuch Conſtitutions and Orders as we now enjoy, is ten times more deſirable, and Charitable, than for your ſakes to part with them. And we are aſſured, under your devices, we ſhall never obtain it. Furthermore, whence hath this Author, That they of the Church hold thoſe things only Laudable, wherein it differeth from *Sectaries?* And that it is not as unlawful according to our Conſciences to omitt them, as it is with their Conſciences to do them? We do not ('tis true) hold them to have any Moral Good in them, of themſelves, and therefore we call them Indifferent.

And

And the *Presbyterians* do not affirm they have any Moral Evil, and therefore grant they may be obſerved. There muſt therefore be ſomething more in the wind than Conſcience, on theſe Mens parts, which detain them: For as much as neither they, nor any man elſe, can pretend an Offence of Conſcience, where there is neither real, nor apparent Evil: but 'tis a contradiction that any thing ſhould ſo much as appear to be Evil, or Sinful, while it appears Indifferent. Therefore according to the *Presbyterians* own Tenets, they may come up to us; for it can only be pretended to be againſt their Conſciences. And if they Alledg any Cauſe, why that, which in it ſelf is not Evil, nor againſt their Conſcience, may be, and is, upon another account, which 'tis eaſie to gueſs at; I will anſwer, That, juſt ſo it is with the Church of *England*: Many things which being not abſolutely, and in themſelves good, or neceſſary, and ſo conſequently may be omitted with a ſafe Conſcience; for certain adventitious advantages, and Exteriour Accounts, no whit inferiour to thoſe of the other ſide, they cannot with a good Conſcience be Aboliſhed, or Omitted. And thus we ſee the Vanities and Miſtakes in alledging Extremities, Moderation, Tyranny, and tender Conſcience, in theſe Caſes.

CHAP. III.

A General determination of the Queſtion according to Reaſon.

THat all Factions, Parties, Perſons, or Religions are not to be Tolerated, or granted Liberty; I think all agree. It will be neceſſary then in the Firſt place, to lay down certain Diſtinctions, ſerving to judge of the reaſonableneſs of ſuch Inhibition towards ſome, rather than others. And they may concern either the Perſons or the Religion, or laſtly, the kind of Tolerations or Reſtraint, themſelves.

Perſons pleading for Liberty of Religion are Firſt, either ſuch

ſuch as are of themſelves altogether Free from any Civil, or Moral Subjection from us, or ſuch as by Birth and Education being incorporated into the ſame Body, and Polity, are, and ought to be, ſubordinate unto the Head thereof.

Secondly the Religion Inſiſted on, and Pleaded for, is either Repugnant to the light and prime Principles of Nature and human Society, or Conſiſtent with the ſame.

Thirdly, becauſe all Reſtraint Moral, ſuch as is Diſſwaſion, Refutation, Excluſion from the Society of others, is by the conceſſion of all Parties inſufficient to ſuppreſs a growing Evil, oftentimes; and therefore outward Civil Mulcts, and Puniſhments are in ſuch Caſe, to be Inflicted; the diverſity of ſuch Puniſhment is to be conſidered. For according to the Civil Law, Puniſhments are either Corporal, or Non-corporal. And Corporal, are either Capital, or Not-Capital. Puniſhment Not-Corporal is that, which diveſts a man of any Profits, Emoluments, or Dignities. Corporal, and Not-Capital, is that, which is Inflicted on a mans Body, without taking away the Life. Capital, is that which deſtroyes Life. According to theſe therefore, it may be anſwered to the main Querie:

Firſt, That it is not only Lawful and Reaſonable to allow a Toleration to Perſons in Co-ordination to us, and not depending upon us; But it is very unjuſt, and unnatural to attempt by Force, to reduce them to our way of ſerving God: For ſuch kind of Force, or Violence, cannot be offered, but by Civil Power aſſumed; and Civil Power ought never to be exerciſed, but by Lawful Authority: and they, whom we ſuppoſe to be of diſtinct Societies and Regiments, can have no Legal right to Invade, or Uſurp upon one another. And this being againſt Juſtice (which alwaies is to be preferred before the beſt Religion) it would be a contradiction to advance and build Religion upon the Ruines of that which Founds all Religion: as *Tertullian* excellently argues.

Humani juris & naturalis poteſtatis eſt, unicuiq; quod putaverit colere; nec alii obeſt aut prodeſt alterius Religio. Sed nec Religionis eſt cogere Religionem, quæ ſponte ſuſcipi debet: non enim cùm & hoſtiæ animo libenti ſuſcipi expoſtulentur. Tertullianus *Ad Scapulam.* ca. 2. *Vide* Thomam 22. qu. 10. *Artic.* 8.

And if this holds good in Perſons Co-ordinate, ſo far that it is moſt unjuſt for Either, to impoſe upon Other their Faith, or Worſhip

Worſhip: it can ſcarce be expreſſed, the horrible Crime and Unjuſtice of them, who being as Legally Subordinate and Subject as tis poſſible for People to be, take the confidence to Arme, to the end, they may reduce their Prince, and Paſtors to the Rule of their Conſciences: And having oppreſſed both, though failing in their Main deſign, the Scene changed, to exceed themſeves in Immodeſtie, and demand that benefit, they would no wayes grant others, whom they had no right at all to deny; upon reaſons infinitely Inferiour to them, they awhile ſince rejected. In theſe ſhameful ſtraits, they ſay with one of their late Politicians, *The Presbyterian Party in* England, *never engaged under a leſs Authority, than That of both Houſes of Parliament.* Good Sir, clear up, and ſpeak out. Did they do well, or not, in ſo Engaging, even with both Houſes on their ſide? If they did well, then did we very ill, to Oppoſe and Reſiſt; Then were all your Enemies Rebells, the King himſelf not excepted: Then why do you not Preach Repentance to us, as we do to you? Then will you, then may you, nay, then ought you to do ſo again, as we profeſs we are bound to do, and alwayes did in our greateſt Perſecutions: And are you not well to be look'd to, think you? But your Caſe is ſtill worſe: For it will never be granted, what is here ſuppoſed. *viz.* That thoſe Two Houſes were Houſes of Parliament, but a *Conventicle* of Private Men, after the Expulſion of that Part of the Lords-Houſe which have been proved to be no leſs Eſſential to a Parliament than the remaining States, had they remained with the *Presbyterians:* but 'tis apparent, not the Major Part continued with them, but manifeſted againſt them: But eſpecially, the *Kings* Authority withdrawn from them, they like *Sampſon* the *Nazarite* being ſhaven, became as other men, and the Spirit of Power, and all Legal Authority departed from them. Or if after all theſe Ruines and Delapidations, they muſt ſtill be called Houſes; in what doth *Presbyterian* excel the following Factions, who had thoſe things, they called Two Houſes too, and with no more prejudices?

Corbet's Intereſt of *England.* pag: 57.

But my Author proceeds, and indeed ſpeaks plainly. *I have read* (ſaith he), *That the Parliament of* England, *is of a Twofold capacity.* Firſt, *Repreſenting the People, as Subjects; and ſo, that it can do nothing, but manifeſt their Grievances, and Petition for Relief.*

Id: ibid.

lief. Secondly, *By the Conſtitution, it hath part in the Soveraignty; and ſo it hath part in the Legiſlative Power, and in the final judgment.* You have read. You may have read, and that from your own party, infinite paſſages of Sedition, and Treaſon: But had you ſo little Wit and Loyalty, pretending ſo much to both, as to Publiſh and approve it, and to juſtifie wicked Practiſes by as bad Principles? But they are in the Faction ſtill, and though like Water in a ſponge or clout ſcarce diſcernible, when let alone, being preſſed a little, out they come. But muſt he that ſpeaks Treaſon, ſpeak Nonſenſe and Impoſſibilities too? For, 'tis not poſſible that the ſame perſons ſhould conſiſt of ſuch a Contradictory Capacity, as that of the Subject and Soveraign. But I return:

It is worſe than Barbarous to Attach, or Oppreſs any People, meerly upon account of Religion, not repugnant to the Light of Nature, as I ſhall ſhew by and by: For otherwiſe, Religion, whoſe chief End is to Conſerve Mankind, in Peace and Juſtice, would turn the Earth upſide, down, and fill the World with inceſſant Combuſtions, and Maſſacres. For it will be as reaſonable that the *Infidel*, and *Indians* ſhould Invade the *Chriſtian* upon that ſcore, as the *Chriſtian* Him. And then where will ſuch Depredations end?

Thom. 22. Quæſt. 10. *Art:* 8. Τὸ βιάζεσθαι καὶ ἄγειν πρὸς τὴν ἀληθῆ θρησκείαν ἀνεύθυνα γίνεται, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκούσιον ὃ βιάζεται ἡ πειθώ. *Iſidor. Peluſiot:* li. 3. Epiſt. 362 *Lactant.* Lib. 5 *Inſtit.* ca. 19. *Chriſtus Apoſtolos miſit ad ſeminandam fidem, qui &c. Ambroſ. In Luc.* Lib. 7. *Pict. ad Conſtant. Joan: Duil: De Vero Uſu Patrum.* Lib. 2. ca. 6.

Again, as *Thomas* hath obſerved, Religion being a Free Thing, there is no Reaſon *Infidels* ſhould be thereunto Compelled. Nay, as *Iſidore Peluſiotes* noteth well, To Force and Dragg others to the true Religion, who are abſolutely at their own diſpoſal; neither is, nor ſeems, Decent or Convenient. And *Lactantius* ſaith, *Non opus vi & injuriâ, quia Religio cogi non poteſt.* There is no need of Force and Injury, for aſmuch as Religion cannot be Compelled. And St. *Ambroſe* Teſtifies truly, That Chriſt ſent his Apoſtles to ſow the Faith, who were not to Compel, but Teach, nor to Exerciſe Force, or Power, but extol the Doctrine of Humility. And agreable thereunto St. *Hillary* writes, *Deus cognitionem ſui docuit potius quàm exegit*, God rather Taught, than Extorted the knowledg of himſelf. To theſe, and this effect, I might add ſuch Fathers as *Monſieur Duillee* hath collected; endeavour-

ing,

ing, though in vain, to prove thereby, that the preſent Church, hath fallen from the Opinions of the Auncient, becauſe they were againſt Compulſion in point of Religion; which, with what I have obſerved ſeeming to favour Liberty in Religion, is eaſily anſwered by diſtinguiſhing of Perſons educated in, and ſubject to a Church, to whom they never granted a Licenciouſneſs of this Nature; from ſuch as were not under any Obligation of Obedience and Conformity to a Society: Of theſe they are to be interpreted, and not of them: For herein they followed the Doctrine of St. *Paul* who ſaies, *What have I to do, to judge them that are without?* And of theſe, are the words of the *Pſalmiſt*, to be underſtood; abuſed by trifling *Sectaries*: *Thy People ſhall be willing in the day of thy Power.* Which implies, a freeneſs of conſent to the Service and Faith of Chriſt under the Goſpel, in ſuch as firſt received the knowledge thereof. 1 Cor. 5. 12. Pſal. 110. 13.

Secondly, According to the Second Diſtinction, it may be ſaid, that there being ſome Religions not only contrary to ours, but even to the Light, and commonly received Law of Nature; ſuch are not only, not to be admitted into any Chriſtian Commonwealth, but it is Lawful for Chriſtians, or not Chriſtians, in vindication of Common-Laws of Nature, even ſuch, which being once and lightly offered to the Conſideration of ſuch as do not obſerve the ſame, do in a manner conſtrain Aſſent thereunto; provided that Intereſt, Paſſion, and unnatural Vices, have not taken away that ſight, which Nature had given. For we know who ſaies, *That the God of this World blinds the eyes of ſom-*: and who ſaith, *Some things men are willfully ignorant of.* Therefore Actual Ignorance neither excuſes, nor exempts men from Puniſhment, even of ſuch, as are not in Political Authority over them. The reaſon whereof, is, Becauſe, however the World be divided into ſeveral Countries, and thoſe Countries ſub-divided into ſeveral Nations and Governments, abſolute in themſelves, as to Political Adminiſtration; yet, are All Men of the ſame Fleſh and Blood, and kind, and nature, yea, Common-wealth, and Familie, as to certain Principles of Reaſon, and Nature, which are as Laws containing men in the ſame Society; and as to the Deſign that God had, in placing Man upon Earth, which was to live at leaſt ſo Humanely, as might continue the Work of Gods 2 Cor. 4. 4. 2 Pet. 3. 5. Act. 17. 26.

hands upon Earth, and the Recognition of a Superior Cause of them, and Power and Dominion over them, which is a Deity; contrary to which, is that most brutish and degenerous Sin of *Atheism*. For though *Atheism*, be not a Religion (of which we now speak), yet it is to be reduced to this Subject, as all Privations are there to be handled, where their habits are properly treated of. Now the *Stoicks*, (as *Laertius* tells us,) were wont to make a Two-fold *Atheism*; *Dogmatical*, whereby men not only know no God, but would prove, There is no God: And *Practical*, whereby men in general having a true, but weak, and obscure knowledg of God, do, as the Apostle saith, *live as without God in the World*; as if there were no such thing Existent. But we shall rather divide *Atheists* into Purely Negative, such as have, nor ever had, no knowledg of a God; and Positive, such as have had the knowledg, and sense of a *Deity*; and after, are fallen into such open *Apostasie*, and *Defiance*, that they *Dogmatize* such Unnatural Opinions. Of these Latter, we hold it just and reasonable, that where they live mixt with other People who do revere a *Deity*, they should be put to Death, after serious and plain Proposal made of their Abominable Errors; without any laborious, or Learned controverting the Point. And this affirmeth *Perkins*, before me, in these Words, *As for those that are commonly called* Atheists, *which deny that there is a God, they are to be punished with Death, as not worthy to live in human Society; and the greatest Torment, that can be devised by the Wit of Man, is too good for them: For, if they be holden for Traytors to an Earthly Prince, and are most deservedly adjudged to Death, &c.* But I suppose, a greater reason than this, is, The certain Destruction which such Embrutiz'd men do bring to human Society it self: which, whoever is a direct and professed Enemy unto, may be put to Death, as lawfully as Wolfs, Lyons, and Tygers. And yet, not at the pleasure, or Power of every one that meets them, as wild Beasts may, because Judgment against the most open Malefactors condemned by the Law, must not be executed, but by Sentence, and Commission from the Supream Power. For to make good one part of Justice, we must not destroy another; nor secure Gods Ordinance in one Point, by endangering it in another. But it is Gods Ordinance, that the Supream Power should

Τὸν φαῦλον Ἄθεον λέγουσι Δίτλον δ' εἶναι τὸν ἄθεον, τὸν τε ἐναντίως τῷ θεῷ λεγόμενον καὶ τὸν τε ἐξουθενητικὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. *Diog. Laert: In Zenone.*

Ephes. 2. 12.

Perkins Cases of Conscience. *Lib.* 2. *ca.* 2.

ſhould be reſpected and obeyed; and it is ſcarce poſſible, that any Common-wealth ſhould be of any long continuance, where private Perſons take on them to adminiſter or execute Juſtice, upon their own preſumptions And if it be, as the wit of ſome *Atheiſts* lead them to conceive, that Religion is only a trick of Policy, to keep men in order, and obedience to their Superiours, and that they do confeſs, that it is neceſſary to keep together a Civil Society; do they deſerve any thing leſs than Death, who ſhall treacherouſly diſcover, and endeavour to Null ſuch a Myſtery of State, without which, Human Society cannot be maintain'd? And ſurely, if *Chryſoſtom's* zeal carried him ſo far, as to adviſe any one that met a Blaſphemer of God, or his Worſhip, to ſmite him preſently on the Face; yea, though he were ſure to be had before the Judg for ſo doing: it is more reaſonable to bait *Atheiſts* and Perſecute them, the Supream Autority not gainſaying. *Eſcobar* tells us the Practice of *Spain*, to be againſt Blaſphemers, *That for a Light Blaſphemy, he only abjures it: Yet, the Puniſhment doth anſwer the Sin.* v.g. *If they Blaſpheme out of ſuddain Anger, or ſome other Paſſion, they are Condemned to the Gallies: or elſe ſtanding bare Foot, and bare Head, girt with a Cord, and holding a Light Torch in their Right hand, they ſtand in ſome Feſtival day in the Church, and the Service being ended, they receive their Sentence with the reſt of their Penances,* i.e. *Faſtings, Prayers, and Pecuniarie Mulcts.* And where Authority is Defective and Remiſs, in this ſo horrible Provocation; It is obſerved by many dreadful Inſtances, how God himſelf taketh Vengeance: as, amongſt others, *Matthew* of *Weſtminſter* tells us How, in the year of Grace 501, *Olympus* a moſt Mad Fellow, while bathing, he Blaſphemed the Holy *Trinity*, that he was conſumed with a Fiery Thunder-bolt falling on him from Heaven. Thus he. And that, not only Corporal, but even Capital Puniſhment is due to ſuch an one, doth from hence appear; becauſe a man being of a Religion which aſſerts the *Diety* under ſuch and ſuch Forms, or Notions; the Profeſſed diſhonouring thereof, implies a ſelf Condemnation, and with all ſuch an unnatural humour of impiety, which leads him againſt all Religions, and human Practice.

Matthæus VVeſtmonaſterienſis, *pag.* 182.

Cunæus De Republic. Hebræ. Li. 1. *cap.* 1. *Item Maimonides in Miſna tractat. de Regibus. ca.* 9.

And it is obſerved by *Cunæus*, That ſuch was the Force of the

Seven Precepts of *Noah*, and extended so to all men, that the *Israelites* were commanded, such who were ignorant of them to slay by War, and remove them from human Society.

Again, it were (I suppose) Lawful for any Prince, or Person to compel any People that should Worship their God, or gods by the Sacrifice of Mankind: And yet we read how far this Devilish Superstition prevailed over the World, as may appear from *Tertullian*, *Austin*, *Alexander ab Alexandro*, *Ludovicus Vives*, *Grotius*, and others. In a Word, Learned *Bodin* tells us, That there was never any People, or Nation, who imagined not, that the Gods might be pacified with human Sacrifices, such as the *Peruvians*, and *Brasilians* at this day use: And, that the *Canaanites* in ancient days Accustomed themselves to such Sacrifices, *Offering their Sons and Daughters unto Molech, that Fiery Idol*; the Scripture Testimonies are many, and express; and not to be eluded, by the vain and bold glosses of Rabbies, attempting, I suppose, to extenuate the foul *Apostasies* of their Predecessors; and that Children were not kill'd, and burnt, but drawn only through two Piles of Fire, and so Consecrated to *Molech*, as Mr. *Selden* hath observed out of them. But that *Molech* was the same with *Saturn*, and the *Phœnicians* offered to him such inhuman Human Sacrifices, *Porphyrie* witnesseth; which agrees perfectly, with the Practice of the *Carthaginians*, who themselves, together with their Superstitious Abominations, descended from the *Phœnicians*. For that the *Carthaginians* used to Offer such Sacrifices; *Plutarch*, not only assureth us, but tells us who, and upon what occasion, caused that Custom to cease. For *Gelon*, King of *Syracuse*, having Conquered them, would not make Peace with them, unless, they would first give over Sacrificing their Children to *Saturn*. Possibly, this unnatural Religion took its Original from the Design of *Abraham* Offering up his Son *Isaac*; which being performed amongst the *Phœnicians*, might be cause of mis-understanding to them, as Innumerable acts of the *Patriarchs* and *Israelites*, were first corruptly imitated by the neighbouring *Heathens*, and by them transmitted and propagated into other parts: so that it was not an inward suggestion of Nature, though very common, so much, as Imitation.

Tertul. Apol. cap. 8. *August. Civit. Dei* lib. 7. ca. 19 *Alex. ab Alexand.* lib. 6. ca. 26. *Ludovic. Vives in Aug. de Civ. Dei. Hugo. Grot. contra Socin.* pag. 200, 201, 202. *Bod. De Repub.* li. 1. cap. 5. 2 Kings 23. 10 *Jer.* 32. 33 36. Psal. 106; *v.* 37, 38, 39. Jerem. 7. 31. Selden *de diis Syris* Syntag. 1. cap. 6. Porphyr. Περὶ Ἀποχῆς lib. 2.

Ὃυ πρότερον εἰρήνη ἐποιήσατο πρὸς αὐτὸς δεομένους ἢ καὶ τοῦτο ταῖς συνθήκαις περιλαβεῖν, ὅτι παύσονται τὰ τέκνα τῷ Κρόνῳ καταθύοντες, Plutarch. Περὶ βραδέως &c.

Again,

Again, were it ſo, that any Nation ſhould freely admit, and practiſe the unnatural Sin, of Coupling with Beaſts after the manner of human Sexes; I doubt not, but it were Lawful, and Laudable in any Forrein Prince, to endeavour the aboliſhing of ſuch a Cuſtom, by Force of Arms, becauſe this is againſt human Nature, by confounding the Species of Man.

In the Laſt place, according to our diſtinctions, we are to conſider, the kind, and condition of Puniſhment to be inflicted upon Offenders againſt Religion; of which, in the enſuing Chapters.

CHAP. IV.

That the Ancients, as well Chriſtian as un-Chriſtian, conſtantly denied Toleration of Religions diſſonant and contrary.

IT is a moſt frequent and plauſible Maxim which *Sectaries* have got by the end, to ſlip their Necks from the uneaſie Yoke of Government, and duty of Obedience incumbent on them, many times againſt their Wills and Intereſts; *He is moſt a King, that rules in the Hearts of his Subjects; and that Prince is alwaies beſt ſerved, and obeyed who by gentleneſs and kindneſs, gains the good will of his People.* And this, though it hath much truth, ſoberly underſtood and modeſtly taken; yet, as by diverſe of late applied, includes in it a world of Knavery and Miſchief. For when will that be, that a Prince ſhall win the hearts of ſuch diſſatisfied, and fond Perſons as theſe, but when he ſhall lay the Scepter ſo lightly over them, as not to hurt them; when he ſhall give them ſo much Line, as that they may do what they pleaſe; when he ſhall remit, and relax the curbing and puniſhing part of the Laws ſo far, as that they may be dallied with, and played with at pleaſure, without Cenſure; when they may Innovate according to the Phanſies of their own Brains, and Luſts of their Hearts: Such a King as this is fit to Rule over a Free Spirited People,

People, Free-born Subjects: and then shall he have their hearts when he requires nothing else, and can command nothing else. But me-thinks such should do well, to think sometimes upon Rules of good Subjects: and that he is a good Subject (according to St. *Paul*) who doth all things [Lawful and Honest] without murmuring, and disputing; and that makes a Conscience of limiting his Superiours in their commands, where God hath not Limited; and should spend some of that time, and shew some of that Piety which they profess, in regulating and assisting their Superiours, by their Precepts to govern them well, in putting in Practice the difficult Art of obeying Well; which Flesh and Blood takes so little content in, that nothing is more ungrateful to them, and an unmortified carnal Man discovers himself in nothing more, than in that humour. But this, the Learning of the wisest, and common Experience, may teach us; that, as no Society of men can subsist without Laws, so no Laws without Coercion and Force; and no Coercion can take place, without Punishment. For as *Tullie* in *Brutus*, and *Plutarch* after him; All Commonwealths, continue, and rest upon Two Principal Columnes, Punishments and Benefits. For neither is Vertue so excellent and amiable in the eyes of all, no, nor Religion, nor Piety; as that men should be so Ravish't with their intrinsick beauty, as to need no External Motives to commend them to us, and excite our Affections; neither is there such a loathsome Turpitude, or eminent danger in Vice, Heresie, or Impiety as that, no outward Discouragments propounded, men of themselves, must as necessarily Flee from them, as they do from Serpents, or Mad-Dogs.

Plato in Gorgia.

Seneca de Clement. lib. 1. cap. 21. *Pœna ad iram respicere debet. Aut ut eum quem punit emendet; aut ut pœna ejus cæteros meliores reddat; aut sublatis malis securiores cæteri vivant.*

Galenus Quod Mores sequuntur &c.

Plato therefore assigneth Two principle Ends in punishing Malefactors: First, Satisfaction for the wrong done unto the Community, by the Offence committed. Secondly, Prevention of like Miscariages, by bringing a Terrour upon others. *Seneca* makes Three Causes of inflicting Punishment. First, that the Punished may be amended. Secondly, or others corrected by their Sufferings. Thirdly, That the Evil being taken away, the Good may be more safe. Somewhat, not much differing from these, doth *Galen* likewise give Three Reasons of Punishment. First, lest they should mischief the Good. Secondly, That a few being Chastised, others may be Reformed. Thirdly, That wicked Men

Men proceed not too far in wickedneſs: All which, hold no leſs in a Religious Commonwealth, than Prophane. For, what ſafety can the ſound Sheep be in, amongſt whom the corrupt and rotten ſhall be permitted to Walk? And what ſecurity can the Righteous and true Believer be in, ſo long as the Infectious Doctrine and Example of *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, which do creep and eat like a Grangrene, whereby the whole Body is in great danger, to be diſſolved, and diſſipated. And the Apoſtle adviſeth *Timothy to rebuke them that ſin, before all, that others alſo may fear.* It hath been therefore the conſtant practice of the Church of Chriſt, for the better conſerving it ſelf in Unity, and Charity; Firſt, to admoniſh and rebuke Litigious Diſſenters and Dividers; and, that not taking due effect, to proceed to ſuch ſevere Puniſhment, as may render ſuch unable to Propagate their miſchievous Tenets. And not the Church only, hath taken this neceſſary courſe, but even *Heathens* have thought it neceſſary to deny a Liberty of Introducing new devices into Religion, to the diſturbance, and Diſſettlement of Others. For *Valerius Maximus* ſheweth how that certain Books being found in *Rome*, making againſt the Eſtabliſhed Religion; the City-*Prætor*, by command of the *Senate*, cauſed them to be burned. And *Tullie* tells us of *Protagoras Abderites*, that having wrot certain Books of dangerous conſequence to Religion, he was Baniſhed by the *Athenians* out of their City and Countrey, and his Books burnt in an open Aſſembly. And what is ſo maniteſt, as the ſore Perſecutions the *Jews* ſuffered under *Antiochus* for their Religion? and, How many and dreadful Perſecutions Chriſtians ſuffered under the *Heathen Emperors* for the Faith of Chriſt? inſomuch, that it is obſerved by *Polydore Vergil*, and others; that from St. *Peter* to *Sylveſter* the Firſt, there being Thirty two *Biſhops* of *Rome*, all ſaving Seven, were *Martyriz'd*. But when Chriſtian Religion, partly by the Invincible Fortitude of Believers, and partly by the favour of ſome *Chriſtian Emperours* became ſo Publick and Rooted, and many were ſprung up from the Loyns of *Chriſtian-Parents*, ſo that they never taſted of Gentiliſm; it ſeemed reaſonable to that greateſt Enemy to Chriſtians, to conſtrain none to Gentile-Worſhip. For thus he writeth to one of his Governours. Οὐδένα δεῖν αὐτῶν ἀκόντα πρὸς βωμοὺς ἰέναι ἐλκύσαι. *We permit not that any*

2 Tim. 2. 17.

1 Tim. 5. 20.

Valerius Max. li. c. 1

Polydorus Vergil lib. 8. ca. 1. *Invent. Rer.*

Julian Epi. 52

any of the Christians should be forced to our Altars.

Nec de Veteri Testam. profero exempla quamvis etiam Propheticis exemplis doceri illa dixisti. Illa, in quam, nimis antiqua non profero; fuerunt enim alterius dispensationis & Temporis. Augustin. Lib. 4. *Contra Crescon: Grammat: Exod.* 22. v. 21. *Deuteron:* 13. 12, 13, 14, 15. *Deuteron:* 17. 12:

But to draw nearer, I shall with St. *Austine* disputing this against *Cresconius*, wave the Instances which may be brought out of the Old-Testament, because they may be said to be of a diverse *Oeconomie*, from those of the New. But most manifest it is, that such as varied from the Religion in which they were Educated, were to be Cut off from their People; which I know is diversely understood, but by All acknowledged to be a severe Punishment. And besides it is undeniable, that such as would not hear the Priests whom God had set over them in matters of Religion, were to be put to Death. Let us see what was the Practice of the Christian-Church.

Pedro Paolo Historie of Inquisition. *pag:* 6.

Non invenitur exemplum in Evangelicis & Apostolicis Literis, aliquid petitum à Regibus Terræ pro Ecclesia. Quis negat non inveniri. Sed non dum implebatur illa prophetia, Et nunc Reges intelligite &c. Psal. 2. *Aug. Epist.* 48.

Optatus Melevita lib. 2. *Contra Parm:* Ὅσοι δ' ἑλληνίζειν ἐδόκουν, τούτους θύειν ἀπείρητο &c. *Eusebius de Vita Constant.* lib. 2. ca: 43, 44: Ἐκεῖνο μέν τοι προαγορεύω ὡς ἄν τις συγγραμμα ὑπ' Ἀρείου & Socratis Hist. lib. 2. ca. 6. *Nicephor.* lib 8. ca. 25.

Learned *Pedro Paolo* of *Venice*, seemeth to dislike Persecution for *Heresie*: in that, treating of the *Inquisition* he argues against it from the Practice of the Church until *Constantine* the Great his time; saying, that until the Reign of *Constantine* i. e Three hundred and Twenty years after Christ, no Penalties were inflicted upon *Hereticks*. But I cannot but marvel, such a judicious Person should take that to be an argument of the Churche's Opinion, That *Hereticks* ought not to be punished; when as, until *Constantines* daies, the Church was never possessed of any Civil Power; and it knew well enough it was against Christian Religion to Usurp it, though to the favouring and furthering of the same. But scarce was *Constantine* rid of that Tyrant, and Heathen, *Lycinius*, but, as *Lycinius*, out of Zeal, persecuted the Christians (which was the Ground of their quarrel, how ever malicious *Zozimus* Fables it otherwise,) *Constantine* endeavoured the suppressing of the Idolatrous *Gentile-Worship*, commanding (as *Optatus* telleth us) the *Temple Doors* of the *Gentiles* to be shut up, and that the Christian Religion should be only protected; and maintained Publickly. And *Eusebius* tells us, that he not only caused their *Idol Temples* to be shut up, but prohibited Sacrifices to them. And this his zeal did not end only in destroying *Idola-*

try,

try, but extended to *Hereſie* alſo. For, after the Firſt Council of *Nice* had determined the Faith Controverted, *Conſtantine* made it an Offence Capital, ſo much as to conceal *Hæretick* Books; as *Socrates* and *Nicephorus* relate. *Auſtine* likewiſe, in an Epiſtle againſt the *Donatiſts* ſheweth, how after the *Donatiſts*-Appeal to the Emperour, againſt *Felix* who ordained *Cæcilianus*, had been heard and rejected, by *Helianus* the *Proconſul*, and that he was declared Innocent, that *Conſtantine* the Firſt, made a Decree moſt ſtrict againſt the *Donatiſts*; and that his Son after him, followed thereiñ his Steps, which continued until *Julians* Reign, who, *De-ſertor Chriſti & inimicus, ſupplicantibus veſtris Rogatiano & Pontio, libertatem perditioni Partis Donati permiſit*, An Apoſtate from Chriſt, and an Enemy to your Supplicants *Rogatianus* and *Pontius*, gave Liberty to the pernicious Sect of *Donatus*. And St. *Ambroſe* makes it no ſmall matter of his praiſe of *Gratian*, That he brought peace and quietneſs to the Church, and ſtopped the mouths (of *Arians*:) and would to God (ſaith he) you could have ſhut the hearts of ſuch wicked men, and miſchievous; And that, this he did aſwel by the Faith, as his own Power. And no wonder that Father ſhould ſo write, who ſaith alſo, That *Hereticks* are more abominable, than the very *Jews* that crucified Chriſt. And *Theodoret* relates at large, how *Amphilochius* Biſhop of *Iconium* prevailes with *Theodoſius*, to exclude the *Arian* Conventicles out of the Cities. And *Bellarmin*, in the Life of *Theodoſius* relateth, that *Honorius* and *Theodoſius* publiſhed an Imperial Edict, whereby they decreed, that the *Pelagians* ſhould be wholly ſuppreſſed and expelled *Rome*: and after ſent their Reſcript to *Aurelius*, Biſhop of *Carthage* in which they Commanded that they ſhould be driven out of *Africa*. And, as Cardinal *Hoſius* hath obſerved, there is Extant amongſt the Proemial Epiſtles to the Council of *Calcedon*, an Epiſtle of *Pulcheria* the Empreſs to the Governour of *Bythinia*, to expel out of the City and Places where that Council was to be held, all Clergy-men, Monks, and Lay-men, who would by no means be brought to the Council. It is true, what Biſhop *Bilſon* hath obſerved, concerning *Gratians* Toleration of all, at his Firſt entrance into the Empire, That finding all places full of *Arians*; and the Laws of *Valens* his Uncle, making for them; Fearing ſome general Tumult, if he ſhould preſently diſtreſs ſo many

Auguſtinus Epiſt. 166 *Donec Felix ipſe juſſu &c.*

Ambroſ. Epiſt. 26.

Id. De Fide lib 3. cap. 3.

Hiſtor. Eccleſ. lib. 5. cap. 16

Bellarm. in Vita Theodoſ. pag. 285, & 286.

Hoſius De Concilio Oecumen. cap. 24.

Bilſon, True difference between Chriſtian Subjection and &c. pag 19, 20.

many, gave leave, that every Religion ſhould have Churches and Oratories, with freedom and immunitie; but being once ſetled and joyned with *Theodoſius*, he commanded that all *Hæreſies* ſhould keep ſilence for ever. And this was the Courſe, as *Beda* well obſerveth, which *Ethelbert* the *Saxon* King, took; who being converted to the Chriſtian Faith himſelf, gave order, that none of his Subjects ſhould be compelled to become Chriſtians; only he ſhewed them moſt favour, and kindneſs, who embraced that Faith which he did. And the reaſon hereof, is obſervable in the ſame Author, *Didicerat enim & à Doctoribus, Autoribuſque ſuæ ſalutis, ſervitium Chriſti voluntarium, non coactitium eſſe debere*: For he learn'd from the Maſters and Authors of ſaving Doctrine, That Chriſts Worſhip ought to be Voluntarie, and not Compelled. But the Firſt of our Nation, That by Law deſtroyed Idolatry, was *Ecombertus*, in the Year, 640. who alſo commanded that the Faſt of 40. days ſhould be obſerved through his whole Kingdom. *Quæ ne facile à quopiam poſſint contemni, dignas punitiones ſieri in tranſgreſſores juſſit*, ſaith *Matthew* of *Weſtminſter*. And becauſe it may be that ſome *Hereticks* will plead for favour, from the carriage of *Ethelbert* above mentioned, it is to be noted, that there is a vaſt difference between *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, and *Heathens* who never had Knowledg of the Truth, as Biſhop *Bilſon* hath truly noted, upon the like occaſion; ſaying, *Hereticks of all ſects and ſorts, may be compelled to follow truth, though Infidels might not; and ſo your Inference faileth when you ſay, No Law forceth Jews, or Pagans from their Perſwaſion, therefore not Chriſtians. Nay rather, if we grant Jews, and Turks excuſable for theſe two Reaſons, Lack of Knowledg, and Want of Promiſe; certainly, Papiſts being neither void of the Firſt, nor free from the Laſt, may, yea muſt, be compelled of Chriſtian-Magiſtrates, for dread of Puniſhment temper'd with good Inſtructions, to forſake their Hereſies, and forbear their Idolatries wherewith Chriſt is diſhonoured, and his truth defaced.* Thus he: Whereby their Plea is further made Void, whereby ſome argue from Toleration of *Heathen*, over whom there is no Authority, the Liberty due to Chriſtians, who do owe ſubmiſſion as well in general, by being Members of ſuch a Society, as particular by way of Promiſe, either Implicite, or Explicite, which each man makes to the Body,

Beda lib. 1. cap. 26. *Hiſt.*

Matthew Weſtmonaſteri-enſis. pag. 224.

Bilſon Difference between Chriſti-Subj. &c. pag. 26.

to

to which he is to conform in all Lawful things in themselves; not measuring things Lawful by the Bent of our Consciences (than which nothing can be more proudly contrived) but by the straitness of some Rule superiour to them both. Whence it was, that *Cyprian*, more ancient than the *Nicene*-Council, or *Constantine*, persecuted so far as he was able the *Novatians*, having no secular Power on his sides; and so did other *Catholick-Bishops* after him, namely *Chrysostome*, and *Cyril* of *Hierusalem*, for which some *Puritans* of our daies with a fellow-feeling, as it were, of their brethrens sufferings, and a never failing Animosity against Bishops of all Ages, have not spared such speeches as these, against them. *Chrysostome, whome none can sufficiently praise, took away many Churches from the Puritans; but this same violence was thought the Principal Cause, for which that most divine Person, suffering such calamities as soon oppressed him, died in Banishment: Cyril likewise oppressed the Puritans* [i. e. *Novatians*] *and this man besides many other evils and adversities which he endured, as well at home as abroad, is branded with this note of Infamy, that he was the First of all Bishops, that Lorded it*; i. e. *Introduced secular Pride and Tyranny into the Church. Let them beware, again and again, who in these daies bear deadly emnity with Puritans, lest they pull upon their heads the ancient Punishments of the Persecutors of Puritans.* Thus far that Frontless, and Witless Patron of *Puritans*, of the *Scottish* Faction, if I mistake not.

Meditatio de Antipuritanismo. pag. 70. *Appendicis ad Laudensium Αυτοκατακρισιν.*

And here before we draw down the Practise of the Catholick Church any lower, because antiquity abounds with the like grievous complaints of *Heretieks* and *Schismaticks* being punished, as this age doth also; Let us consider a little what themselves did, when ever their strength served them.

The *Arians*, as we have shewed, were Persecuted by the *Catholicks*, and having secular Authority on their side, did they not stir up most grievous Persecutions against the Church, upon all occasions? Are not all Histories full of their Impious and Bloody Prancks? In so much, that *Onuphrius* on the Life of *Sylvester* the First by *Platina*, saies, The Nine Persecutions being taken away by *Constantine the Great*; the Tenth, from the *Arians*, ensued, more dangerous than all the others: which begining under the Emperor *Constantius*, continued upon the Church of God

Onuphrius in *Sylvest.*

in such manner, for Forty years together. So far *Onuphrius*; Whose Opinion might easily be confirmed by the Authorities of *Hilary* of *Poitiers*, *Hierome*, *Socrates*, *Theodoret*, and others; were not that superfluous Labour, in a matter confessed.

And were the *Donatists* any whit more favourable, and mild when they had any, though but small advantage, over the *Catholicks*? He that reads *Optatus* against *Parmenianus*, the main Treatises of St. *Austine* against them, the Conference of *Carthage* between the Schism of the *Donatists* and the *Church-Catholicks*, shall find, that the same Faction which was ever most querulous under Persecution, and moving pitty and compassion in those that would hear them, of their hard measure, and of the unreasonableness of the Civil Powers interposing in such matters which ought to be free, were themselves most Cruel and Violent against others; and especially, the Bishops and Clergy men suffered horrible things, which were tedious to rehearse; putting out the Eyes of some; and they cutt off the Hand and Tongue, of one Bishop, and some they slew right-out. I say nothing of the cruel Slaughters (saith he) and Plundring of Houses by Night-invasions, and Burnings; and that not only, of Private Houses, but Churches also, into which Flames there wanted not some who cast in the Books of God. Do not these words of *Austine* come somewhat near a description of our late furious and wicked zeal. And what *Possidonius* in the Life of St. *Austine*, addeth of this nature against that Holy Bishop, calleth to our minds afresh, the Perfecution of the Tongue against our Bishops: The *Donatists* (saith he) railed at *Austine*, called him Seducer of Souls, both Publickly and Privately; and said, That he ought to be slain as a Wolfe to their Flock; and that without doubt all their Sins should be forgiven them, who could bring this to pass. And in another Epistle of St. *Augustine*, is the Inhumanity of those pure *Zelots* the *Circumcellians*, a branch of the *Donatists*, against such as differed in Opinion from them, described; concluding, *In quibus omnibus illi non deponunt facta Latronum, & honorem sibi exigunt Martyrum. i. e.* In all which, they cease not to act the parts of *Assassins*, and yet require the honour of *Martyrs*. And, so infinitely Devillish and Malicious was their humour, that when they could not destroy the *Orthodox* by Butchering them, they would needs terrifie

Et maximè Episcopi & Clerici horrenda & dura perpessi quæ commemorare longum est quando quorundam oculi extincti &c. Au. Epist 5. *Vide* & Epistol. 166.

Possidonius *in vita* August. *ca* 9. *Vide ca.* 10. *etiam.*

Augustin Epistol. 68.

terrifie them, by Murthering themſelves; and ſo, as *Auſtin* hath, either Solacing themſelves in the deſtruction of us, or ſadding us by their own Deaths. And ſuch in ſome degree, do our daies afford, who becauſe they cannot have their Will-worſhip, will put themſelves into ſuch an untractable and brutiſh poſture, that if you let them alone they have their ends, if you attempt to bring them to Juſtice, they will create great hatred to their Adverſaries, by parting with their Lives, rather than ſtir upon fair

Quidam eorum miſerabili inſtinctu, & Deo & Hominibus ingrati, ſuis cadibus nos vaſtare non poſſunt, suo nos exitio terrere credunt; aut lætitiam ſuam quærentes de mortibus noſtris, aut triſtitiam noſtram de mortibus ſuis. Auguſt. Epiſt. 61.

or neceſſary means, or motives. To conclude, It is the obſervation of St. *Hierome*, *We have read, we have ſeen, we have daily found it true, that when ever Perſecution hath aroſe in the Church, the* Jewes *and* Hereticks *were always more grievous Perſecutors of the Chriſtians than were the* Gentiles.

Legimus, vidimus, quotidiéque comprobamus; Quando perſecutio contra Eccleſiam oritur, multo pejores perſecutores Judæos & Hæreticos, quàm Ethnicos. Hieronymus *in Obad. v.* 10.

CHAP. V.

A Continuation of the former Subject, and particularly, of putting Hereticks *and* Schiſmaticks *to Death.*

IN man may be ſaid to be a Twofold Life, Natural and Civil. The Firſt is an Union of the Natural parts of a man; which being diſſevered, death follows; underſtanding here the principal which are either ſimply Eſſential, as the Soul and Body or ſuch, as are therefore called Vital, becauſe being corrupted, or taken away, a ſeparation of the more Eſſential parts do immediately follow. Mans Civil Life is that, wereby he being a member of the Civil Body, ſeparated from that (as all Integral parts of a Body Natural) loſe that life of common Influence and Protection. Hence it is, that ſome Civil Lawyers do interpret Capital Puniſhment ſo often denounced againſt *Hereticks* in the Civil Law, of the later Death; as doth *Huckleman*, and ſome others. *The Imperial*

Constitutiones Imp. Simplici er capitis pœnam insligentes Hæreticis non de Naturali sed de Civili Capite asserit. Wessembeck: in Para. num 6. *Huckelmanus Illustr. Disput.* 34. Thes 14. lit 6. *Cod* li. 1. Tit 5. *Cod.* li. 1 *Tit.* 5 *Sect.* 4. *Volumus esse publicum crimen &c.*

perial Constitutions which absolutely inflict Capital Punishment on Hereticks, *are not to be understood of Natural, but Civil Death, as Transportation and such like.* But I make no doubt, but this is too favourable, and forced an Exposition, as he that shall observe the Practice, the best comment on the Law, must confess. For when the Code saith, *Manichæi undique expelluntur & capite puniuntur.* And immediately before, *Manichæo, in loco Romano degere deprehenso, caput ampuatur. i. e.* The *Manichees* are to be expell'd, and punisht Capitally, The *Manichee* that shall be found in the *Roman Territory* shall have his *Head cut off*; cannot be meant of Civil Head. I confess the most common punishments, are such, as we read in the same Title against the *Manichees* and *Donatists*, made by *Honorius* and *Theodosius* Emperors. *viz.* 1. "We decree "it a Publick Offence; because an Offence against Divine Reli- "gion, is an injurie to all: wherefore we Persecute such with "the Confiscation of all their Goods. 2. We will likewise that "they be Defeated of all Liberality and Succession coming to them "by any Title whatever. 3. Furthermore, we leave such no "Power to give, or buy, or sell, or make bargains, being convict. "4. Inquiry ought to be made at his Death. For if it be Law- "ful in matters of Treason, to tax the memory of the dead; not "undeservedly ought there here also to pass a judgment. 5. Ther- "fore his last Writing is to be Null, whether by Will, or Co- "dicil, or any other way, he hath made his Testament; if found to "be a *Manichee*. 6. Neither do we suffer his Sons to Inherit, "unless they forsake their Fathers Errours. For we allow Pardon "to the Penitent. 7. We like well, that they feel the sting of "our Authority, who shall entertain them in their Houses, by a "culpable providing for them. 8. And we Will, that their Ser- "vants be faultless, if avoiding such Sacrilegious Masters, they "pass into the Catholick Church by a more *Faithful Service.*

Thus far the Imperial *Edict* of *Theodosius*, whereby we may easily discern how severe the Ancients were in chastising *Hereticks*, and the several kinds of Punishments devised against them. But the great question is, Whether it be just to punish *Hereticks* with Corporal Death, according to the Judgment of the Ancient Church. The first instance of such severity, is that of *Priscillianus* who was put to Death for his Heresie: about which I find

find the Fathers themselves divided. *Hierome* against *Ctesiphon* seems not only to approve of it himself, but to say, that the whole Christian Church consented thereto, *Quid loquar* (saith he) *de Priscillitno, qui & Seculi gladio, & totius Orbis authoritate damnatus est*? Why should I speak of *Priscillianus*, who was Condemned by the Secular Sword, and the Authority of the whole World? *Hierom. Advers. Ctesiphon.*

But *Severus Sulpitius* liked not this Fact, as appears by his words, *Priscillianus cum sociis Capite plectuntur, pessimo exemplo necati.* *Priscillianus* with his complices were beheaded, being killed with a very ill precedent. And *Theognostus* condemned *Idacius*, or *Ithacius Clarus* an eminent Bishop of *Spain*, as witnesseth *Isidorus Hispaleusis*, because he procured the death of *Priscillian*, as did also other Catholick Bishops, as a bloody man: yet, by a Council held at *Triers*, about the year 386. he was absolved by the favour and intercession of the Emperor *Maximus*, by whose Authority it was done. St. *Augustine* is known to have been of an opinion once, that *Hereticks* ought not at all to be Compelled to the true Faith; but afterward his judgment altered, and that (as he saith) from the experience he had of the excellent effect such coercion had; and especially, in that divers, who at first took upon them the profession upon compulsion, afterward embraced it sincerely and freely: And in the same Epistle, answereth the allegation of *Pedro Paolo* above mention'd, which the *Donatists* likewise urged against the *Catholicks* persecuting them, *viz.* No example is to be found either in the Evangelists, or Apostles writings, whereby any thing was begged of Earthly Kings in behalf of the Church, against the Churches Enemies. *Quis negat non inveniri* (saith he)? *Sed nondum implebatur illa prophetia, Et nunc Reges intelligite &c.* Psal. 2. *i. e.* Who denies that? for as yet, that Prophesie was not Fulfilled, *And now understand ye Kings, &c.* Yet do I not find, that this Father approved of killing *Hereticks*; but in another Epistle proceeds in a milder, and middle way, that is, Neither to Tolerate the *Heresie*, nor Condemn the *Heretick* to Death; because that were to cut off all possibility of Repentance, and Reconciliation to God, and the Church; which is very hard to deny any man, before God doth; And that God doth, no man can say, so long as he granteth him life. And to me, it seemeth not very difficult to answer *Thomas* his Arguments and *Bellarmines* who are for the death of *Hereticks*. Thus

Severus Sulpit. Sacræ Hist. Lib.

Isidor. Hisp. De Viris Illustr. ca 2.

Vide Baron. An 386 nu. 25

Augu?. Epi. 48.

Augustin. Epistol. 48.

Id Epistol. 50

Thom. 22. qu. 11 Art. 3.

Thus then argues *Thomas*. If he may be burnt who counterfeits money, Why should not he that Forges, and Publishes false Doctrine? "If he that counterfeits the Kings Letters deserveth "death, What doth he that counterfeits, that falsifies the Scrip- "tures and the Divine Letters of the Lord? A woman that "breaks the Conjugal Faith made to her Husband, ought to die; "and not much more he, who keeps not his Faith with God? And he "that takes away the Life of another unlawfully, suffers the loss of "his own for it; shall not he therefore who destroys his own, "and neighbours Soul? To these pretty Analogies and colourable arguments for the Death of *Hereticks*, we readily answer, by granting all that the arguments crave, which is, that *Hereticks* deserve to suffer as much, and more if you please, than such notorious offenders against the Commonwealth, and Civil Justice. But must therefore this punishment be necessarily corporal and outward as the other, whose cause is Civil? this, by *Thomas* his good leave, follows not. But rather the contrary. That their Punishment should be Proportionable to their offence; Their offence was Spiritual, and their sufferings must be such too: their offence was greater, and so shall their punishment be in Soul by eternal Death. And this answers *Bellarmines* six arguments to prove, that *Hereticks* ought to suffer such Capital Punishment. First because, as all confess, *Hereticks* may be Excommunicated lawfully, therefore they may be kill'd: The Consequence is thus drove; Because Excommunication is greater punishment than temporal Death. To which I answer, That therefore it should have a greater death; but that, that death must be of the same kind, doth not follow, that is, temporal. Secondly, he saith *Experience teacheth that there is no other remedie.* But I deny any such experience: For I make no doubt but the punishments mentioned even now in the Code, will in a short time extirpate *Hereticks*; and perhaps sooner, considering what a pride some *Hereticks* take in suffering, even death, for their errors. Thirdly, His Third is that with *Thomas* his, *viz. Hereticks* are Cheats and Counterfeits. And so is his Fourth taken from a Womans falseness to her Husband. The Fifth is, because All the reasons that *Galen* alledged against Malefactors, hold here. *Answ.* First, That they should be punished, they do: Secondly, that they would be punished

Bellarm. De Laicis. li. 3. ca. 21. *Probatur, &c.*

niſhed with death alſo, but not neceſſarily with Natural death; but Civil death may ſuffice here, and Eternal death hereafter. Sixthly, (Laſtly) he ſaith, It is a kindneſs to take obſtinate *Hereticks* out of this life: for the longer they live, the more Errours they deviſe; and increaſe greater damnation to themſelves *Anſ.* We muſt diſtinguiſh between temporary, and perpetual obſtinacy: And between that which may be, and is, certainly known to Judges for to be. Judges muſt proceed according to the Evidence of the Fact, not the probability. But no man can certainly know, that, how ever a perſon be Actually obſtinate, he will perſiſt in the ſame to his Death.

But, notwithſtanding there be no more than we have heard in Reaſon, or Religion, for their putting to death, and not many examples are to be found in Antiquity; yet for the laſt Five hundred years ſince Chriſt, hath it been but too much put in practice under *Roman*-Tyranny. For that Hot-ſpur *Genebrard*, whoſe deſign it was to give us an account of the Churche's Practice, ſpeaking in defence of that cruelty ſhewed againſt the *Kathari* (or *Puritans*) who were burnt at *Colen*, in the year of our Lord 1163. meerly for Religion, and that none of the worſe; and endeavouring to juſtifie that Fact from ancient Precedents of the Church, could, it ſhould ſeem, find none much above 60. years older than that; and that was of that *Arch-hæretick Baſilius* a Phyſitian, who in the laſt year of Chriſt 1102 was by the Command of the Emperor *Alexius* burnt at *Conſtantinople* for his *Hereſie*. But after-Ages abound with ſo many ſad Inſtances of that nature, that it were ſuperfluous and tedious to rehearſe them: From all which, I only inferr thus much: That they, who generally approved, and practiſed ſuch extream rigour, could not but much more commend ſuch more moderate means of reducing, reſtraining, and extinguiſhing them. And I preſume, if I can ſhew what much more ſevere courſe hath been uſed towards *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks* ſince our Reformation in *England*, it will not appear ſo great inhumanity, to put in ſtrict execution ſuch Laws as have of old and later dayes been made againſt them.

Genebrard. Chronol: An: 1163.

In the Raign of *Henry* the Third, ſaith *Hollinſhed*, were two *Impoſtors* hanged, for giving out, that they were Chriſts. In the Raign of *Richard* the Second, and *Henry* the Fourth of *Eng-*

land, Statutes were made for the putting *Hereticks* to death, which ſtood in force until the Raign of *Henry* the Eighth, who cauſed them to be repealed: but in lieu of them, he made ſuch an *Edict* (conſiſting of Six Articles, called therefore, The Whip with the ſix ſtrings) that thereby, the Life's Blood of many a good and ſober Chriſtian, was taken from them. But in the Firſt of *Queen Mary*, the former Statutes, as more for her Bloody purpoſes, were revived and re-inforced: of which, as a thing too apparent for Impudence it ſelf to encounter, I ſhall not ſpeak at preſent, and but touch afterward.

But neither have there been wanting inſtances ſince the Reformation, of ſuch Capital Puniſhments executed. For in the Fourth year of *Edward* the Sixth, or Third (as Mr. *Stow* hath it) *Joan Butcher*, otherwiſe called *Joan Knell*, and vulgarly *Joan* of *Kent*, was burn'd for her *Hereſie*, denying Chriſt to have taken Fleſh of the Virgin *Mary*. And on the 24*th*. of *April*, the ſame year, *George Paris*, a *Dutchman*, was burnt in *Smithfield* for *Arianiſm*: And in the ſame King's Raign, an *Anabaptiſt* of *Chelcheſter* was burned. And truly, he that is of an Opinion, that no man ought to ſuffer death purely for Religion, may notwithſtanding approve of the putting to death, ſuch as ſhall bear falſe witneſs, in ſuch a Caſe at leaſt, as that of profeſſing themſelves to be that Perſon they in truth are not, whereby manifeſt and intolerable evils are done to private Perſons, but much more to the Weal-Publick; when one ſhall pretend himſelf to be ſome Prince, or Publick Perſon: Much more therefore he that ſhall have the Impudence to give out that he is Chriſt (have he a particular *Cant* of his own to evade the common ſenſe his words import, when he comes into danger) ought no leſs to undergo death, than he that ſhall ſeek to Tranſlate the Government of a People, properly belonging to another Prince, upon himſelf. And as for *Anabaptiſts*, though I think their Dogm's are a little purg'd of late, over what ſome years ſince they have been, (as moſt *Hereticks*, and *Schiſmaticks* are, when they perceive they will not take, nor be endur'd in their original Rankneſs): yet, if they ſtick but to one or two, charged commonly on them, ſuch as are, Denying to the Civil Magiſtrates, Power of the Sword; and affirming an Exemption of (their) Saints from human Laws; ſuffering corpo-

Stow Chron. Ari. 3. Edw 6

ral

ral death for the same, they have no wrong done them; neither can they plead Religion to protect them in causes of Civil cognisance, as they are. And to hold an opinion (as many now adays do) that their Governors have no Authority Ecclesiastical over them, in things neither forbidden nor commanded by God's word, is to draw very much nearer to the pernicious Extreams of the *Anabaptist*, than can consist with the good opinion such have of themselves, and would beget in others of being very moderate Men. But I return.

In the third of Queen *Elizabeth*, one *Jeffrey* taught publickly, That *John Moor* was Christ; who were both first whipt, and then upon repentance were committed to Prison for half a year. This was a favour shown upon repentance. The more pittiful and strangely tender conscienc'd Judges were they in the Houses called a Parliament of late years, who could discharge *John Naylor* an Impostor, as foul and blasphemous as any of his Predecessors, without any considerable notes of true repentance. So far did the Doctrine of Liberty of Conscience drive many Patrons of it. *Stow An. 3d. of Qu. Eliz.*

Again, in the Seventeenth year of Queen *Elizabeth*, twenty-seven *Anabaptists* were brought to justice, whereof two were burnt in *Smithfield*; four renounced their Heresies at *Pauls* Cross, and thereupon were released, the rest were condemned to die, but were only banished. In the twenty one year of the same Queen, one *Hammond*, a most insolent *Arian*, denied Christ to be God, and blasphemed Him, and the Gospel, and was burnt in *Norwich*: And about three years after, one *John Lewis* was burnt in the same place for the like Heresie. And in the Raign of King *James* one *Legate* was burnt in *Smithfield* for *Arianism*. *Stow in Eliz.* *Id.*

For King *James* his Raign, and Queen *Elizabeth's*, it is generally known how they put not any Papist to death for their Religion, though presently they were Sainted for dying in the *Roman* cause, and, as they will have it, for Religion; and if they will have it so, so let it pass, for me: But then we must take leave to turn to, and adhere to our old Notes, which tell us of their Faith, that it is Faction; and their Religion, Rebellion. For, were it so that the Laws interdicting *Popish* Priests of this Nation, bred and ordained beyond the Seas, from coming into this Nation, this were no such sanguinary practise as many Popish Ministers loudly and indeed

childiſhly give out. For I would know whether the Supream power of this, as well as any other Nation, have not power to inflict the puniſhment of baniſhment upon lighter cauſes than this? For inſtance, Might it not be reaſonable for an Act of Baniſhment to take place upon all ſuch as ſhould tranſport Wool, or Fuller's-earth into foreign Countries? The perſon that ſhould do this returns into *England*, and is put to death, according to the Law. But he cannot be ſaid to be put to death for having tranſported prohibited Commodities, but for breaking the Law of his Baniſhment. No more can Popiſh Prieſts, taking Orders from that Church, and returning, be ſaid to ſuffer for taking Orders, or for their Religion, but for breaking the Act of their Baniſhment; for, by Law they all ſtand baniſhed; and if a greater puniſhment than baniſhment be not annext to that Decree to make it good, inſtead of being ſanguinary it will become ridiculous and ludicrous, and ſo will the Authors of ſuch Laws alſo. In the year, One thouſand, ſix hundred, forty and one, *Ward*, *Walker*, or *Waller* (for, as I take it, the man after the *Roman* cuſtom had three or four names) being a Popiſh Prieſt was hanged at *Tyburn*, where he confeſſed, he had been baniſhed no fewer than three or four times. Do not ſuch mockeries and contempt of Laws as this, deſerve death, yea, though the Law it ſelf were unreaſonable?

And now, as to the other ſide, with which we have to do, the *Puritan* Faction; let us ſee how they have been proceeded againſt, before theſe three laſt Decads of years, and whether it be ſo new and ſtrange a matter that they ſhould be moleſted, or oppreſſed; and the rather becauſe of that Officious Author of the *Intereſt of England*, who puts on the Countenance of a Moderator, and grave and wiſe decider of the point of Toleration: but alas, beſides his many lamentable failings, he could not keep on his Mask above a leaf or two; and in a certain place ſpeaks thus, much more boldly than knowingly or truly. *Take notice that the Epiſcopal Clergy did not go about to exterminate the Puritans before their latter times; and then he that had half an eye could diſcern the notable advance and the confident expectation of the Popiſh Faction.* And may not he that hath never a bit of an eye perceive what is ſo palpable, that ſince the Puritans had ſuch influence, and favour ſhown them as of late, that the Popiſh Faction is advanced ten times more than when they were

Corbets *Intereſt of England*, pag 129.

better

better kept under? And, this partly through the infinite scandal given to our Reformation by them; partly, forsooth, that for their tender Consciences sake such an indulgence and connivance general must be allowed, that Papists (who have no less to show for a Toleration than have they) must be comprehended in it too. But what doth this Man mean to write so at a venture? but that which moves them all, prevail'd with him; *viz.* that the common people would not trouble themselves so far as to suspect what he says, while he speaks what they would have him. What think you of those that Doctor *Crackenthorp* says against the Fugitive Bishop of *Spalato*, (who for that reason, that Puritans were tolerated in *England*, took a prejudice against the Church of *England*) were persecuted for their Consciences? Was not *Cartwright* cast into Prison? Was not *Brightman* degraded, and put from his Priesthood? Were not *Wigginton*, *Calverwell*, *Salesbury*, *Field*, *Hilderst.* *Parker*, *Stoughton*, *Smith*, *Jackson*, and others, turned out of their Livings, and suspended from their Priests Office? *Udal* and *Penry* adding to their obstinacy revilings of the Queen's Majesty, one of them was put to death, and the other received capital sentence, and was punished? Were all these or any of these of so late standing as you mean? Do we not hear of most lamentable complaints of old, made by the Puritans, of the sore persecution they ever sustained, and do they now accuse later times, holding the former innocent? The Letters between the Lord *Burleigh* and Arch-Bishop *Whitgift* are yet extant, whereby it appears that there were very many Ministers turn'd out of their Benefices in those days, in the County of *Essex*, only for scrupuling the Rites and Ceremonies of our Church. And more for the satisfaction of others, who are apt to think Civil severity too much for the Church to have on their side against such Men as these, than for this Authors sake; Consider what Sir *George Paule* writes in the Life of Bishop *Whitgift*, and we shall be easily convinc'd that our Church acts no new thing, nor the Civil Magistrates so much as was wont to be done in behalf of the Church in the earlier days of Reformation. *Thomas Cartwright* and *Edmund Snape*, with others, were called in question, and proceeded withal in the Star-Chamber for setting forth and putting in practice, without warrant or Authority, a New Form of Common Prayer, Administration of Sacraments and Presbyterial Discipline in the year 1591. Again, the Queen was offended that

Crackenthor. *Defensio Eccl. Anglicanæ Con. Archiepisc. Spa. cap.* 33.

Fuller *Eccles. Hist.*

Sir *George, his Life of Bishop Whitgift. pag.* 40.

Id. pag. 54.

Cart-

Cartwright should preach without Subscription. Again, Good execution of Laws (his own words) against Puritans kept things quiet; especially by the assistance of the Lord Chancellor *Hatton*. And had he who so lately bare that name and office dealt more sincerely and uprightly towards the Church, I suppose he had had no more to answer for, either before God or Man, than now he hath. Again, he proceeds. After him, Sir *John Puckering* was a friend to the Church. And lastly, Sir *Thomas Egerton* Lord Keeper was very careful to suppress the foresaid *Libels*. And those Libels were none other but the religious stuffe invented and vented against the Church of *England*, and the Asserters thereof.

Id. pag. 55.

Id. pag. 58.

Id. ibid.

And this may suffice to have shown what the ancient Churches judged of Hereticks, and Schismaticks, and the allowance of them, and what our Churches hath done in reference to them. It is now more than time that we come to shew what both the opinion and practise of both of them have been towards us, that so, if there be remaining any Candor in the breasts of these importunate demanders of the same, they may blush to require it, or at least, give us leave not to blush to deny the same. And the God of all Justice do that which is right in his eyes between us. And first let us hear the Papist, as briefly as the cause will permit.

CHAP. VI.

Papists directly and absolutely against Toleration of many Religions, or any besides their own.

WE have shewn out of *Thomas* and *Bellarmine* already, that Hereticks ought to be put to death, and why; and he that will be further satisfied therein may easily turn to Commentators on *Thomas*, and find his opinion confirmed and justified, without any further trouble here undertaken, to the drawing out this discourse to a length more tedious, than necessary to the Reader. Only from hence we may infer, what is a manifest consequent to what hath been said, *viz.* That if such may be cut off so by the Secular sword, they, according to such mens judgment, may and ought to

be

be restrained and suppressed by punishments of an inferior rank, and milder nature; unless it be said by Papists (as in truth it is by some) what the Presbyterians say for themselves, as we have shewed, That Prelatists may and ought to come to the Presbyterians, but the Presbyterians cannot, nor ought to come to the Prelatists; That punishment ought to be taken of the Evangelical [Professors] that is, the *Reformed*, but the *Romanists* ought not *to be punished*. So Demonstrative are the reasons, and so ingenuous are the writings of both Papist and Puritan. But we must not altogether be guided by such Oracles as speak so broadly and vainly; if there be any such thing remaining or to be respected in the World, sure this is reason that Mens testimonies should conclude against themselves, when there is nothing but disadvantage to them which make their cases different. For, neither the one nor the other can modestly deny the Principles and Doctrine of the Church of *England* to be less inconsistent with the Civil Government, and not so rank in persecution of opinions differing from it, as are they; and yet forsooth they, where they cannot persecute, must not be persecuted, or touched; where they can, must not be questioned. Now that the *Romanists* will not endure any competition in Religion, appears by what is said above, and by these several instances.

Johan. Houlettus *Præfatione ad Regiam Majestatem: apud* Humphredum *Admonit: de Curiæ Romanæ praxi; contendit, de Evangelicis posse, de Romanensibus non posse sumi supplicium.*

In the year of our Lord Five hundred fifty five, as *Funcius* tells us, *Pelagius* was made Bishop of *Rome* in the room of *Vigilius*, by the Emperor *Justinian*. This Man (saith he) defined that Hereticks and Schismaticks who refused to be brought home to sound Doctrine, were to be restrained by the Secular Power. And that this hath been the currant judgment of that Church, their Modern writers declare. Do they not make this Defence theirs, and Offence of their Enemies Religion, one of their First Principles and Documents which they season Princes with? Let the Work of *Ribadeneira* the *Jesuite* speak for all. In the year 1597 he wrote a Treatise in *Spanish*, Printed at *Antwerp*, Of the Virtues of a Christian Prince; The Subjects of some of the Chapters of which Book, are these. *That it is impossible, that Hereticks and Catholicks* should make a good League, in one and the same Commonwealth. *Chap.* 24. Examples of Certain Emperors, who suffer'd not many Religions. *Chap.* 23. The same is proved by the Authority, and Examples of Saints. *Chap.* 26. That *Hereticks* ought to be punished:

His Hereticos & Schismaticos nolentes ad saniorem Doctrinam reduci rationibus, sed culari manu coerceri posse definivit. Funcius *Comment. Chronol. lib.* 8. Ribadeneira *de las virtudes del Principe Christiano lib.* 1. *cap.* 24. *cap.* 23. 26, 27, 28.

nished: and how prejudicial Liberty of Conscience most be, *Chap.* 27. That *Heresies* are the Causes of Revolutions and Ruines of States. *Chap.* 28. From such Titles as these, it is easie to divine, what is contained in that Work: I have thought good to leave all to the ingenuity of the Reader to judge, rather than to exceed in unnecessaries. To this Author, let us add one of the same Fraternity, *Becanus*, in a tractate against *Paræus*: where he lays down this as a Second Principle, *Liberty of Religion and Faith is unlawful, and contrary to Christian Doctrine, and hurtful and pernicious to the Commonwealth.* His Reasons are these. *First*, Because, as Divines teach very right, *Heresie* is a greater sin than *Adultery*, *Murther*, or *Theft*. *Secondly*, The Doctrine of Christ is true; But true and false, are contrary. *Thirdly*, Liberty is hurtful: *First*, In respect of the Salvation of Souls; *Secondly*, In respect of outward Peace and Tranquillity: For this cannot be preserved without Unity of Faith.—"A third Princi-"ple of his is this, A Catholick Prince can neither prescribe, ap-"prove, or introduce Liberty of Religion, but must hinder the "same, as much as possibly he can. But yet, if he cannot hinder "it without greater dammage to the Publick good, he may per-"mit it, as the less Evil: Hitherto *Becanus*. And that very Villain *Parsons*, in a Treatise of Mitigation, writeth thus, *We agree with the Protestants in this, that there can be no agreement between us and them in Religion.* Yea, so far did this mans Zeal hurrie him for Religion, who himself was by his own side suspected to be an *Atheist* in heart, that presuming at length by his many State-Stratagems, and Treasonable Practises, to subvert both Church and State, as they were then established, that one of his requests to the *Pope* was, That *England* being reduced to his Model, none other *Popish* Orders might be Tolerated in *England* save the *Jesuites* and *Franciscans*, which were not like to disagree so much as *Secular Priests* with other Orders and the *Jesuites*; while these kept to their particular Rules of having all they can lay their hands on, and they of having nothing. And I have been told, that even since the Restauration of his Present Majesty, the Emulation and Animosities have been so great, that after several Pamphlets, For, and Against *Secular Priests* and *Jesuites*, the *Secular Priests* with the assistance of some of other Orders under-took

Becanus De Fide Hæreticis servanda, Contra Paræum.

Parsons Mitigation. *cap.* 2 *num.* 5.

took with some Great Persons that, upon condition they might have a Toleration (which is the most that any Faction did at first Petition for) they would take care, that the *Jesuites* should never be admitted in *England*: of which, Mr. *Cressie*, that busie *Apostate*, can give you a farther account. But when a man considers how that subtil, industrious, and powerful Faction hath baffled all the severest *Edicts* against them in such Countries where *Popery* flourishes, he will scarce believe that such a device could take effect, or, if it did, could continue long. Could any Decree be more solemn, or sharp against them, than that, made by *Henry* the Fourth of *France*, whereby, the *Jesuites* were all to depart *Paris* within Three daies, and within Fifteen, to forsake the whole Kingdom; and a Pillar to be erected in Publick, for Posterity to read their wickedness and doom; for the Assasination of that Great Prince in his own Chamber, by a young bird *John Chastel* of about 18 years of age, of the *Jesuites* bringing up: And yet, such was their Dexterity, Dissimulation, and Interests with *Pope* and all *Princes* of their Religion, that about Ten years after, the very same King should be imposed upon so far, as to demolish the Monument of their Wickedness; repeal his Banne, restore them again: And in the very same year (as most then, and there living, judged) the same King being Murthered right-out by *Ravilliac*, instigated by those holy men; they not only escaped censure, but carried the matter with such artifice, that the Kings heart must be given to them, as his best Friends; and conveighed to a Convent of theirs at *La Flech*: Notwithstanding, thus much *Ravilliack* confessed (who would confess but little) that by reading *Mariana* the *Jesuites* Book, he was impelled to commit that Fact: Whereupon *Cotton*, the *Jesuites* Chief Father, wrote a Book to the Queen, endeavouring to shew, that they held no such opinions: But another Author wrote a Book, which he entituled *Anti-Cotton*, wherein he manifestly proved the contrary. *An. Dom.* 1594

And did not the State of *Venice* in *Paul* the Fifths time, upon discovery of their treacherous, and mischievous Prancks, expel them their Dominions, adding a Law after them, which made it Death for any, to propound any thing to the *Senate*, in order to their Return; yet have they so brought it about, by the *Pope*

their ſingular Friend; and by the *Turk* their happy Enemy; and laſtly, by their infinite Treaſure, That admittance and welcom is granted them into their Countries.

But to return: Judg we yet farther of their Opinions, concerning Toleration of others, from that prophane Fop, Author of *Fiat Lux*, who, in a good humour, profeſſes great kindneſs to both *Prelatical* and *Puritan Party*; but that forced fained Part being ſoon laid down, and he returning to himſelf, compares them both to the Bond-maid, and her Son *Iſmael*, and then nothing leſs will ſatisfie him, than, *ejice Ancillam cum Puero ſuo.* Out with them both; Surely that the *Papiſts* may enter, and have not only free, but alone Poſſeſſion! For he adds; This is the only remedy and means of Peace. *Pag.* 260.

But *Bellarmine*, where we above quoted him, gives us not only his opinion, but reaſons, why *Heretick*s may not be ſuffered, which are worth the reciting on this occaſion. This then is the ſubject of one Chapter, *Non poſſe conciliari Catholicos cum Hæreticis, i. e.* There can be no Reconciliation between *Catholick*s, and *Heretick*s: And whom he means by both, no doubt is to be made. Firſt, then he begins with *Caſſander*, and quarrels with, and confutes him: whoſe opinion, and deſign he tells us it was, That Princes ought to find out an Expedient to reconcile *Catholick*s, *Lutherans*, and *Calviniſts*: and that until this could be effected, every one ſhould be permitted his Faith; provided he received the Scriptures and Apoſtles Creed. But herein the Cardinal was miſtaken: For in that Treatiſe, *De Officio Pii Viri, &c.* quoted by him, *Caſſander* has neither any ſuch words, nor deſign: but this muſt be rather found in his Conſultations; and even there, he doth not propound any thing for the Toleration of diverſe Religions, but the reduction of Religion to Primitive Rule of Holy Scriptures, Interpreted by pureſt Antiquity, which was the moſt equal, and viſible outward means of Reconciling Differences. But his Reaſons, why neither *Lutherans*, nor *Calviniſts* ought to be Tolerated, becauſe they are ſuch for the moſt part, that War againſt himſelf, and Pretenders to Moderation at preſent; we will here ſet down. Firſt, becauſe we agree not in the Creed it ſelf. Secondly, *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts* are no true Members of the Church. Thirdly, *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts* differ *Bellarm.* li. 3. To. 2. ca. 19.

more,

more, than in Rites; in such things as are of greatest moment, and yet not contained in the Creed it self. 4. The Holy Fathers, and the Apostles, require that we should observe not only the principal, but less Matters. 5. If it be free to believe as men please in one point, by the same reason they may be suffered to believe so in others also. 6. This is a new opinion of *Cassander*, and therefore to be suspected. 7. This opinion renders the Church altogether obscure and invisible.

And in his 21*th.* Chapter propounding this subject, *Posse Hæreticos ab Ecclesia damnatos temporalibus pœnis, etiam morte multari:* He first tells us how *John Huss* at the Council of *Constance* affirmed that it was not lawful to deliver incorrigible Hereticks to the Secular power, and suffer them to be burnt; and how *Luther* affirmed the same, and that it is no new error; for as much as the Donatists held the same: after all this he adds, *Contrarium docent omnes Catholici, & aliqui etiam Hæretici*; i. e. All Catholicks teach the contrary, and some Hereticks; of which sort is *Calvin*, who caused *Servetus* to be burnt at *Geneva*: and so *Aretius* caused *Valentinus Gentilis* to be put to death at *Berne*. You may see his *Thesis* proved afterward by several places of the Old and New Testament, which I list not here to relate; they are obvious of themselves. *Stapleton* in his Sermons confirmes this saying, *Qui libros Hæreticorum legere, &c.* 'They 'who think it no sin to read Hereticks Books, or suppose they may 'be suffered safely, consider not what that imports which our Savi- 'our says, *Beware of false Prophets, &c.* And to imprint this the better in our minds, he tells us with great gravity and seriousness, a Tale out of the common Budget, thus. 'The Abbot *Cyriacus* 'Presbyter of *Laura Calamon*, near the River *Jordan*, saw in his sleep 'the Blessed Virgin pass by his Cell; and being very importunate 'with her that she would vouchsafe to come in [and surely to take an 'hard bed] she replied, How can I enter into thy Cell while thou 'keepest by thee mine enemy? and, so having said thus, went her 'way. But he waking, marvelled what this should mean; but at 'length having ransacked all his Cell, he found two Books of *Nesto-* 'rius stitched to a Volume of *Josephus*. Answerable hereunto is the applause given by *Surius* to the Emperor's Decree made in the year 1540. for the burning of Hereticks Books; and his own opinion largely deliver'd in justification of such punishment towards Hereticks.

Staplet. *Promptua Moral. Domin 7. post Pente.*

Pratum Spirituum. cap. 46.

Surius *Commentar-rerum gestarum in Orbe. An.* 1540 *pag.* 400.

Guilielmus Parisiensis, *De Fide, cap. 2.*

ticks. And though *Guilielmus Parisiensis* were a Man of that moderation and gravity in other points, herein he seems to be most severe; saying, *Quicquid contra veram credulitatem est, error est. Consequens igitur est, omnem credulitatem quæ communi fidei contradicit, errorem esse impietatis; & ideo gladio & igne exterminandam.* i. e. 'What 'ever is against true Faith, is an error. From whence it follows, 'That all belief which is against the common Faith, is an impious 'error, and to be driven out by fire and sword. So that true is that of *Episcopius* to *Wadding* the Jesuit, whom he advises to consider it; The *Roman* Church holds this for an undoubted Axiome according to his confession, and particularly *Rosweden* in his late Treatise of the evil Faith of *Capellus*, that Hereticks are to be put to death, their Books to be burnt, and their Faith to be kept under by eternal silence.

Consideres deinde Ecclesiam Romanam, &c. Episcop. Respons. ad Wadding. Epist. De Regula.

But this short taste of a plentiful table of such stuffe as this, may suffice, as to the *Romanists* opinion, which their practises have superabundantly confirmed; of which to speak a little, as it will not be impertinent, so to speak much altogether superfluous; the whole being but too apparent.

And here we may begin with the *Romish* Inquisition constituted of so much injustice and cruelty as scarce can be matched any where. It began, (saith *Pedro Paolo*) after the year One thousand, two hundred, the principal Inquisitors being the *Dominicans* and *Franciscans*, who sprang up about that time. And about the year of Grace, One thousand, two hundred, forty four, *Frederick* the Second, Emperor, published four Edicts at *Padoa*, in favour of the Inquisitors; whereby, obstinate Hereticks were to be cast into the Fire; and, such as repented, were yet to be kept in Prison perpetually. And this Inquisition in tract of time hath acquired so much strength and fury, that Princes themselves have been subject to it, and oppressed by it, as lamentably appears in the sad instance of *Charles* Prince and Heir of *Spain*, who upon suspicion only, that he favoured Hereticks, falling into the Paws of these merciless Lions, was put to death against his Father *Philip's* will, and endeavour to the contrary; as *Joachimus Ursinus* witnesseth. Yet I know there goes a tradition that his own Father caused his death, upon such a suspicion: which, if so, the matter is but little mended as to the extream rigor used by the Inquisitors, and the *Roman* Zealots against Hereticks.

Pedro Paolo, *Histor. Inquisit. pag. 6.*

Joac. Ursin. *Præfat. ad lib. Reginal. Ursin. de Inquisitione.*

Which

Which the Duke of *Alva* (that Butcher of Christians) further demonstrated in his Generalship over the *Netherlands*, so that he gloried at his Table, that, for the extirpating of Heresie, in the space of six years only, he had caused to be grievously tormented and put to death about Eighteen thousand, besides such as he had destroyed in the War out of hatred, by private murders also, as *Metaranus* writeth. And long before this, In the days of *Innocent* the third, were burnt of the *Albigenses* a Hundred and eighty at one time, as *Bellarmine* testifieth, and justifieth too: But *Baronius* out-vies him: for he saith, that in one day in the year One thousand, one hundred, eighty three, in the City of *Burdeanx* alone, Seven thousand of them were slain. But anothers report much more surpasses his, affirming that in the year One thousand, two hundred and nine, in the same City were slain Sixty thousand *Albigenses*. In the same year, in the Village *Minerva* an hundred and eighty were burnt alive. In the year One thousand, two hundred, and a eleven, Four hundred were burnt at *Pulchra Vallis*. Again, in the same year in *Lavarum*, Eighty were put upon Gibbets. In the same year Eighty of the Nobles were beheaded; neither did they spare the Women. Again, in the year One thousand, two hundred, and thirteen at *Mirellum* many were cut off by the Sword, more consumed in the River, twenty (*Prateolus* saith, Seventy) thousand were slain. In the year One thousand, two hundred, and nineteen, at *Miromanda* were slain 5000. In the year 1236. about fifty were burnt or buried alive. And in the year One thousand, two hundred, forty two, in a small Village in the Diocess of *Tholouse*, about Two hundred were burned. By all which we see clearly what Execution the Inquisition did, newly then erected. *Sleiden* tells us further of one who was burnt, because he could not approve of all the *Roman* Rites. And *Melanchthon* of another, who was burnt in a place not far from *Basile*, because he did eat Flesh. All which agrees perfectly with the definition of Pope *Urban*, who saith, 'We do not judg them to be Murderers, who, out of zeal to Catholick Church, shall kill some 'Excommunicate persons.

And in *France* Twenty thousand men were slain in, and about *Paris*, upon the Licence given, by the Duke of *Guise*, to root out

Meteranus *Histor Belgic. lib.* 4. *pag.* 127. Bellarm. *lib* 3. *cap.* 12. *De Laicis.* Baronius: *An.* 1199. numb. 33. Guilielmus Armon. *De rebus à Philip. gest. apud Bzovium.*

See Bzovius, Matth. Paris, *and quoted by Doctor* Crackenthorp. *Defens. Eccles. Angl. Cont. Spalatens. cap.* 18. Sleiden *Com. lib* 6 *Meminimus loco vicino Basileæ crematum esse quendam propter esum carnium.* Melanchthon *Epistola ad* Marchiacas *Ecclesias Causs.* 23. *q.* 5. *cap. Excommu.* Summar. *of Religion, p.* 31.

out the *Evangelicks*, as *Sleiden* reports to us. To this, if we add the inhuman as well as unchristian Fact of *Charles* the 9th. of *France*, by whose Connivenee and Concurrence, if not command, so many thousands of *Hugonots* were Massacr'd for no other real Reasons, but because they were of The Religion; however blushing at the Immanity of the Fact, a pitiful groundless tale was told concerning Plots should nave been laid by them; we need proceed no further: For such an intolerable and treacherous piece of Barbarity it was, that our Adversaries, and their Friends that committed the same, have nothing more, or better, to answer for it; but that we are too prone to remember it: and they too prone to commit such Butcheries and Inhumanities against them, that differ from them in Religion, and are too unwilling to learn of them.

Not long after the First Light of Reformation in *Spain*, were estimated about 2000 of that Profession, and were it not, (saith a diligent Observer of Men and Countries) for the Inquisition, all the Country would soon be overspread with them of the Reformed Religion. In *Sevil* alone were thought to be 12000, who all by the violence and vigilance of the Inquisition, have been suppressed and brought to nothing. Let not *Papists* therefore wonder and brag both, of their plentiful Harvest they have of late days reaped of Proselytes, by putting their Sickle into our Corn, for, were it so, that such remission of Laws, such an indifferency were cherished and countenanced in Persons, such a permission and favour to Seducers were granted, as is apparent hath been given to our Adversaries, it would appear in a short time in *Spain* and *Italy*, what a great difference there would be in the success, to the advantage of our Religion.

Sr. Edwin Sandes.

And can any doubt be made, what favor or Toleration we are to expect from *Papists* here, in this Nation; were we in the power of their hands, as they either are, or might be in ours, how they would dispose of us; when it is so unanswerably evident how intolerably they have Persecuted our Religion already in *England*: so that, as one observes, in two of the six years Raign of *Queen Mary* only, diverse Testimonies and Letters testifie no fewer than 800 persons were put to most cruel deaths in *England*, for their Religion only. And our *Acts and Monuments*, of their

Epistola Anti Ridlei um De Cœna Domini.

their Bloody minds and hands are such lasting evidences against them, that they have no better way to save their reputation, but by scoffs, and merrie Flouts, which with such as are ambitious to be counted Witts, rather than Religious, is of greatest Force. And that Lack-manners and honesty *Parsons* shall be heard upon his scurrilous humour, rather than he, whose Shoes he was unworthy to carry; as to Learning, Fidelity, or Piety. Tis not denied what is most colourably objected, that Mr. *Fox*, might set such down for Martyr'd Persons who suffered not. But considering that he, following the Decrees and Sentence of Death publickly extant against such persons, together, with the time and place determined for that end, might authentickly deliver that for done (though peradventure such things might interpose, between the Lips and the Cup, which might alter Sentence given) which particularly, and precisely to find out through all *England*, was very hard.

And to write a History, or rather a Tragedy of what was Acted by Rebellions, Treasons, and Conspiracies in King *Edward* the Sixths, Queen *Elizabeths*, and King *James* his daies only, for their Religion, were to speak truths most pertinent to our subject, but shameful to such, as are of that Communion, and plead for Liberty. How do we wish for no other testimonie, than that of their own Consciences; how incompatible with Civil Unity and Peace this Design is? how certainly it would turn, and is by them intended for our Ruine and Destruction, as well as their own safety? and we needed not such, and so many sad and invincible Instances of their Irreconcilableness to, and Inconsistency with us, in any co-ordination, or equality of Priviledges? How do we wish that men would be so fair, as to stand to their own Hands of outward Practices, and then needed there no curious Inquiries into mens judgments, or resolutions: But when mens Cause and Hearts so far fail them, that they dare stand to the Tryal of neither of these, but will have judgment pass on them by the future, which is invisible, and impossible to be known but by what is past; and when neither their Pens, nor their Swords shall conclude, but a sorry word or two in their straits, shall be taken for sufficient proof of Natures and Wills: then doth there remain nothing for us, to betake our selves to, but our

Prayers

Prayers; and them, not so much that God would keep us in our Religion, but Wits.

Divers are their Papers and Pamphlets, whereby they would amuse such as understand or regard nothing, with the reasonableness of their Religion, and the merits of their Persons; but both the one and the other have been, with all ocular Demonstrations, convicted of the contrary by sober and plain replies made unto them. They Mascarate themselves most frequently under the plausible and taking Appellations of Old Cavaliers, and having so disparaged the King and Churches party, they exspatiate with strange levity and vain glory in the common place of Self-admiration, and highest commendations: *viz.* What Men of parts, and power, and ingenuity, and fortitude of mind, in bearing Persecutions, which have been hitherto nothing but acts of Grace and favour. But they tell us not how they laugh in their sleeves at all Proclamations and Laws for their restraint, and banishment of their Seminaries, and Incendiaries, as being secure in the midst of such insignificant thunders, and presumptuous in the midst of their pretended fears. And from truth and sobriety of language are they degenerated in their writings into such frivolous, fallacious, and meer childish humours of moving compassion, where reason cannot be shaken, that a Man of any insight in the course and causes of things cannot but despise their empty and groundless Apologies. I shall touch but two of their more common pleas, and places for themselves, and so leave them. The one is, That *Papists* are tolerated in divers Parts of *Germany*, in *Holland*, *Switzerland*, in *France*, and I know not where else: as if that were all true which they affirm in this particular; or, as if so much as is true were any whit to our present case: For, neither in the Free Cities in *Germany*, or certain Countries (as they would suggest and perswade against the certain knowledg of the wisest) are either Papists tolerated in Protestant Countries, or Protestants in Popish. But in the first troubles and dissentions (even to civil discords and armings on both sides) an accord was at length made, and composition, That such Churches and Places should belong to Papists, and such to Protestants; so that they never had one over another perfect Dominion, either Ecclesiastical or Civil, from the ruptures made amongst

Letter of an Old Cavalier in *Yorkshire* to one in *London*.

amongſt them; whence it is evident, that the one beareth indeed with the other, but neither gives Toleration to other. And this is the Caſe chiefly of *France*: where, though the true Soveraign of both be of the *Romiſh* Church, yet cannot it be ſaid that he freely gives them Toleration, ſince that was concluded upon when it was not in the King's power to deny, and was ratified in the Agreement, which they of the Religion (as they are called) made with their Prince (whether orderly or irregularly is not now under queſtion) upon the mutual pacification; ſo that the Laws of that Nation and the conſtitution thereof do as truly require the inviolable obſervation thereof on one ſide as on the other, and ſecure the Proteſtants. But our Laws are directly contrary thereunto, and the reaſon hereof is well known to be, the unreaſonableneſs and indomitable malice and miſchief of Papiſts extorting theſe ſevere Edicts.

And in *Holland*, what Toleration have they? Any Legal, or Publick Act of Grace in that behalf, which is pleaded for here? Nothing leſs: but they and their Religion are at the diſpoſal of Military Officers to repreſs, or permit, according as gain ſhall ariſe to them from a Connivance. And let any indifferent Perſon judg, whether the Caſes be alike: and eſpecially in this, That ſuch as are *Papiſts* in the *United Provinces* have expended their lives and treaſures to bring the *State* to that condition it now enjoys; and ſurely may with good reaſon expect ſome benefit of quiet and eaſe under the ſame: On the other ſide, our *Papiſts* have perpetually machinated, and to their Power executed Plots and practiſes pernicious to our preſent Government both Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, and thereby forfeited all Protection of Laws, and common ſufferance.

And whereas they never ceaſe, as with the ſwell'd cheeks of Fame to ſound out their own praiſes for their late adherence to *Charles* the Firſt, in his Warrs againſt the Rebells (which is their Second main Topick for Indulgences;) How do theſe their Merits melt away, not ſo much before the Sun, as Candle; ſhewing theſe great Flaws in their pretences, and Inſolidities? Firſt, put Caſe that they had done ſuch ſingular and ſignal ſervice (though I think that the Kings Cauſe was never, in the groſs, advanced by the moſt valiant common Drunkard, or noted *Papiſt*, through the Scandal given to them of ſober Manners, or Religion) Did

they rise in their Allegiance above the duty of Subjects? Again, Were they all on that side? Were they all of that mind? Did none of the *Popish* Faction, act to the prejudice of the King? How apparent is it, what a mixture of *Papists* heads there was, in the laying the Design of the Rebellion, as well in *England*, as *Ireland*? and how Priests of all sorts mingled themselves, disguised in the Parliaments Army, to widen and inflame Differences? There are Treatises extant shewing this, which though peradventure, may have over-acted their part, yet so much of reality do they contain, which notably may allay the braggs of unspotted fidelity to their King and Countrey. Bishop *Williams*, in a Treatise he wrote in the heat, and height of Rebellion, tells us upon his own knowledg, that of Fifty, or Sixty Soldiers that billetted in *Adthorp*, there was no less than three or four *Papists* of the Parliaments Army. Add hereunto the idle, as well as treacherous Piece of Mr. *White*, *Of Government*, whereby he asserted the Right of Rule, belonging only to the Line of our Kings, to him that villanously Usurped it, or any one else that could get it; and their faithfulness shrinks into a less compass. Besides, be it true, that they were so generally Couragious, and Faithful to their King, as is talk'd of; Could no sufficient agnition, or remuneration be thought of, but such as turned to the extream dammage of such, as were no less Faithful and Loyal, than were they? Or, did they not only purchase glory and benefit to themselves, but misery and undoing to others, by their Merits? They were not (it may be as truly, as boldly said) above the Twentieth Part of the Kings Forces. Whence comes it then, that they make more noise than all others? From their generous minds which they boast of? And must the Generality of the Nation be certainly undon that they may receive their just reward? But that the whole Nation must in short time lose its Religion, and Sacrifice it to theirs, is most apparent, out of what hath been shewed of their Tenets, and Facts, who never rest till they are chief; and being chief, never suffer men of another Perswasion to live, so much as basely under them. But then, must they not be requited and gratified for their Acts? Surely, their reward hath followed them, in that their Persons and Estates have been Rescued out of the hands of their, and our Enemies, by the favourable Influence of the Kings Government;

Williams Bishop of *Ossory* Discovery of Mysteries. *pag.* 52.

Government; and more they cannot modeſtly contend for. Or, if we ſhould grant a Proportion greater to them, than any of the Kings Subjects elſe, might it not ſuffice that they have perſonal Priviledges of Preferment, Dignities, or Liberty to themſelves; but muſt their Acts ſo far preponderate all of another Religion in the ſame ſervice with them, that they ought to tranſmit to Poſterity ſuch rewards; and theſe immunities from Laws muſt they for their ſakes be granted to all as are nothing akin to them but by Religion? But conſider we laſtly, with what circumſtances, and motives, their Loyalties were qualified: and we may eaſily diſcern that Self-preſervation might be as ſtrong an argument, as was their famed Loyalty. For they ſaw plainly the Rebel-Houſes aimed at their Ruine, and ſeized their Eſtates. Had they any more profitable way then left them, or probable, to oppoſe their Enemies, than by giving Aſſiſtance to the King? And when their own Intereſt might ſuffice to joyn with him, as is frequent for neighbours to aſſiſt their weaker Enemies, to prevent a more potent and dangerous Adverſary; muſt this be cryed up, as ſuch incomparable good Service, as can never, nor any other way, be recompenced but by opening a door to our own Perdition? When they ſo cheerfully, and cleerly eſpouſe the Cauſe of King and Country againſt their Religious Intereſt, (as hitherto they have only joyntly with it) it will be much more ſeaſonable and proper to demand ſuch Remunerations (though not ſo great) as now they expect. But to ſtretch to ſuch length, breadth, and height their late Actions by Amplifications and Encomiums, as if they could as eaſily merit Earth, as Heaven, by doing ſcarce their duty; and to faign themſelves even half mad with admiration, and aſtoniſhment, that any of the Friends to the King, ſhould yet ſuſpect them of Diſloyalty, is but to follow the humor of their Religion, which teaches, Becauſe their Church hath not erred at ſometimes, therefore at no time muſt it be thought for to Erre. Which yet, as unreaſonable as to all the World it appears, we will engage to comply with them in, when they ſhall be able to give but the tithe of Inſtances for their peaceableneſs and loyalty, as we ſhall for their Seditions, Treaſons, Rebellions, and Conſpiracies againſt all Government not hallowed with their Profeſſion. In a word, never let their unparallel'd

confidence in justification of themselves as to Obedience and Loyalty prevaile over them, to imagine we will deny our Senses and Experience, and all Record, and Histories to the contrary: For, were there no more ingenious way to put these things out of doubt, we would readily pawn our Heads against their Beards, and our Lives against their meanest Limbs, that so far as writings and actions past can give any proof of future dispositions, and motions, (I do not say a *Papist*, but) *Popery* cannot consist with the Peace of this Nation or Church, as now established, we will undertake to Demonstrate; when ever they shall be so bold as to tempt us to put them to so much just and necessary shame. And in truth, this has been so far and fully done, and that lately by others, that were, it my present design (as it is not) to paint them out in their Postures, and Colours, the labour would be unnecessary: This therefore will I leave for them to be still astonished at, and me to prove; That a *Papist*, as a *Papist* and following the most received and current Doctrine taught by that Church, (some I easily grant, as in all other points, may vary somewhat, but they are but few, and contemptible with them,) and put in practise can never be a Loyal Subject, under any Prince not of the *Romish-Church*, any longer than necessity humbles him, and despair of prosperous success keeps him tame. Let us therefore hear what the other Extream, the *Puritan*, hath to plead for, or rather against, himself; and whether he be a Child of better hopes, who gives us the very same promises with the other, and himself the same praises.

CHAP. VII.

The Opinions and Practice of Puritans, *directly opposite to that kind of Liberty of Conscience they argue for, and at present desire.*

IT hath been observed by some, that the *Jesuites* and *Puritans* had their Original at the same time, with the difference of one year only. For the *Puritans* began to shew their Head in the year 1536; and the *Jesuites* were admitted at *Rome* in the year

year 1537. But *Sanders* and *Genebrard* affirm they ſprang up in the year 1566. And I have heard the Providence of God towards the Church admired and magnified amongſt Foreign Papiſts, who at the ſame time that the Presbyterians aroſe, ſtirred up the Jeſuites to oppoſe and countermine them. And I find it one of the beſt popular arguments in the mouths, and lately in the writings, of Presbyterians, That they ought to be tolerated, and not only ſo but cheriſhed in this Church, for their ſingular enmity and oppoſition to Popery; which, when they are once put down, they give out muſt needs enter in. For thus ſpeaks one of no ſmall account with them, *And verily if there were a deſign to reconcile* England *to* Rome, *let all means be uſed totally to quaſh the Puritans or Presbyterians; but if* England *will keep her ſelf pure from* Romiſh *abominations, let her be a kind Mother to theſe her Children; for this Intereſt is one chief ſtrength of the Reformed Proteſtant Religion.* Thus he.

Sanderus *De Hæreſib. p.* 221. Genebrardus. *Chronol. Anno* 1566.

John Forbes Intereſt of England, *pag.* 46.

An argument, as current as it is, this is, conſiſting equally of Folly and Knavery, as will thus appear. Firſt, becauſe we having found by direful experience that the Presbyterians, as well as the Papiſts, have not only contrived and conſpired againſt our Churches welfare, but have actually moſt ſcandalouſly and cruelly endeavoured the utter overthrow of the ſame, and ſtill ſtick firmly to the ſame Principles, which inſtigated them to ſuch unnatural and unjuſt practiſes; may not their argument (as indeed it hath been) be turned thus againſt them for the Papiſts? Verily if there be a deſign to become Presbyterians, then let the Papiſts be totally quaſhed; but if *England* will keep her ſelf pure from the Dominations of *Scottiſh* Presbytery, then let her be kind to the Papiſts, who have done as much againſt them as they have againſt the Papiſts; thus does the extream vanity of their argument appear; the only courſe to preſerve our ſelves in peace and unity being to ſerve them both alike. Again, were it ſo that by accident (for it cannot be ſaid out of deſign to the good of our Church) either of them might contribute ſomewhat to the good of the Church as now eſtabliſhed, the rule which *Seneca* gives us in ſuch caſes is not to be neglected, *Non ideò vitia recipienda ſunt quia aliquando aliquid boni effecerunt*, 'Evils are not to be admitted, 'becauſe at certain times they have had ſome good effect. So neither ought we to run to Popery for fear of Presbytery, nor run to Presbytery, for fear of Popery. But the way of arguing is likewiſe very

Seneca *lib.* 1. *cap.* 12.

very knaviſh, in that by implication, a wicked ſlander is caſt upon our Church, that it muſt needs favour Popery, if Puritaniſm be wholly rejected; But if we deny them ſuch prevaricating Reaſonings, we cut them out of all their prime confidences, and take away their moſt principal and ſucceſsful Weapons. Therefore, leaving this, let us come nearer to their teſtimonies againſt themſelves. In which, becauſe they pretend great reverence to Foreign Divines of the Reformation, it will not be much out of the way to ſet down one or two of their Authorities againſt them.

Beza *de Hæreticis à Magiſtratu puniendis.*

It is well known that *Beza* hath written a Tractate on purpoſe, That Magiſtrates may, and ought to puniſh Hereticks, which they of his ſide, who doubt of this point, may turn to, and be convinced. I ſhall cite this only paſſage out of him, and ſo leave him. *Cedò igitur Chriſtus quo jure flagella bis corripuit? Quo jure Petrus Annaniam & Sapphiram occidit? Quo jure Paulus Elymam excœcavit? Num Eccleſiaſtici Miniſtrii? Minimè profectò. &c.* [you that hold that the Magiſtrate ought not to puniſh Hereticks] Tell me I pray, By what authority did Chriſt twice take a whip up? By what authority did *Peter* put to death *Annanias* and *Sapphira*? By what authority did *Paul* put out the eyes of *Elymas*? What, by the Eccleſiaſtical Miniſtry? Nothing leſs truly, unleſs thou wilt confound Juriſdictions. Therefore was it done by the authority of the Civil Magiſtrate: For, there is no third way.

Peter Martyr writeth not only againſt profeſſed Hereticks, but ſuch as call themſelves tender-conſcienc'd men too, allowing them toleration no longer than they may receive ſufficient inſtruction; and addeth, *Imò neque in ipſis mediis rebus Infirmis eſt aſſentiendum, niſi tamiſper dum melius ac perfectius doceantur. Ac cum rem, &c.* 'Yea, neither in things indifferent are we to yield to the weak, unleſs for a while, until they may be better and more fully inſtructed: 'But ſo ſoon as they have underſtood the matter, and yet are doubtful, their weakneſs is not to be cheriſhed. Beſides, ſo much ought 'not to be attributed unto ſuch, as that by our example we ſhould 'hurt others, and more of the members of Chriſt. Thus *Martyr*. And it is to us plain (however they muſt and may be of another opinion) that by giving way to them that thus pretend tender Conſciences, we ſhould offend Conſciences a great deal better ſetled,

Petrus Martyr *Loc. Com. Claſ. 2. cap. 4. numb. 32, &c.*

and

and more to be regarded and valued than theirs, which (as experience from cruel havock they have made in Church and Commonwealth, assures us) strain at a gnat and swallow a Camel.

And what other course took the *Contra-remonstrants* against their Brethren in the *Netherlands*, after the Council of *Dort*, but this; when they refused to submit to the sentence then given? They decreed, That every one should be deprived of all, as well Ecclesiastical as Scholastical Offices, who refused to submit punctually to the Acts of the Synod; and, that no man should be admitted to the Ministry for the time to come, who refused to subscribe to the Doctrine there declared, and preach according unto the same: And in pursuance of that final determination, no fewer than two hundred of the Opposite Party, who could not conform to the Acts thereof, were forthwith banished the Country; a Proclamation following them from the Magistrate, That no Man should afford them any help or maintenance. Does not this match for a hair the extreamest persecution can at present be objected to the Church against Puritans? Or rather doth it not exceed it?

Act. Synodal. pag. 324.

Synodal Remonstrat. in Præfat.

Bullinger telleth us with full approbation and commendation, *Dudum D. Urbanus Regius una cum omnibus Luneburgensibus Ecclesiæ Ministris, edito etiam libro Germanico jure divino & humano coerceri Hæreticos, tum etiam jure civili; si non desinant impia, &c.* i. e. 'Master *Urbanus Regius*, together with all the 'Ministers of *Luneberg* hath lately published a Book in the *German* 'tongue, whereby he sheweth that by the Law of God and Man, 'and Civil Law too, Hereticks ought to be restrained, if they cease 'not to scatter wicked Doctrines, or have scatter'd blasphemies a-'gainst God. And in the same Epistle he telleth us, Not long since *Titian*, an *Italian* Anabaptist, an *Hebionite*, and *Helvidian* was cast into prison by the three Confederate Countries of *Rhetia*, and had 'been burnt, had he not made a Recantation; and yet, notwithstanding 'that, was whipt by the Court.

Bullingerus *Epist. ad* Calvinum *Epist.* 103 *inter* Calvini *Epistolas.*

And what *Calvin's* opinion was in this point we needed not inquire further than we are taught from his Fact, principally in causing *Servetus* to be burnt at *Geneva*. But his Institutions and Epistles, where he is much displeased with good *Melancthon* for straitning the breaches, and qualifying the distempers of both sides; and on the other side, his Book against the *Anabaptists* do clearly shew and prove unto us.

But

But whoever pleaseth to satisfie himself more fully and particularly concerning the opinions of Foreign Divines in the case of conscience about the granting liberty to scrupulous persons in matters of Indifferency, may consult *Monsieur Durels* diligent Collections of several of them, negatively concluding against Liberty in indifferent things, to any or many single persons, contrary to the constitutions of a Church: And in truth, they that contend for the same cannot shew a Church upon earth that indulges so far. So equal and ingenuous are they to tug so undeniably for it of us. But I now draw homeward, where I may be the more brief, because Bishop *Bilson* hath to any reasonable mans hand, already proved this Thesis, That Magistrates may compell their Subjects against their pretended consciences to Ecclesiastical Orders.

Bilson's Difference of Christian Obedience from, &c. *pag.* 33.

Who of them can refuse Mr. *Cartwright*, the Authors of the Admonition compiled in Queen *Elizabeths* days, and many Supplications to the Parliaments in those days? do not they all run in one strain of abolishing utterly the established Government? and *Cartwright* in particular excepting against the Common Prayer for permitting the people to depart at the time of Communion; saith,

Th. Cartwright Reply to *Whitgift. pag.* 117.

'It ought to provide that all those who would withdraw themselves, 'should be by Ecclesiastical Discipline at all times, and now also 'under a Godly, &c. by Civil punishment brought 'to communicate with their Brethren. And this is the Law of God, 'and this is now, and hath been, the practise of the Churches Reformed, &c.

And I hope they take not Mr. *Perkins* to be any of their Enemies, though I think he had too much Learning and Honesty to be a Fautor of such designes and practises as are now on Foot: He, in a certain place, writes thus, 'In persecution of the Church by *Paul*, two 'points are to be considered, The manner or measure, and accomplishment; the manner is, That he persecuted the Church extreamly, or above measure. That which *Paul* did in his Religion 'we must do in ours. His meaning plainly is, That as *Paul* in a false Religion and Zeal did persecute the true, so we in the true (and surely every man supposes himself of the true Religion) ought to persecute the false. And afterward he hath these words, 'The Toleration of two Religions in one Kingdom is the overthrow of Peace. And in another place of the same Comment upon the *Galatians*, he hath

Perkins *on Galat.* 1. *vers.* 13, 14. *pag.* 201, & 202. *vide.*

Id. *Galat.* 5. 15.

hath these words, 'For this cause, the *Jews* had but one Temple, Id. *Galat.* 3. 23
'one Mercy-seat, one High-Priest, &c. Hence it follows, that in *pag.* 289.
'all Godly Christian Commonwealths where true Religion is esta-
'blished, there may be no Toleration of any other Religion. For,
'that which is the end of Gods Laws, must likewise be the end of
'all good Laws, in all Commonwealths and Kingdoms, namely to
'shut up the people into the unity of one Faith. Thus far Mr. *Per-*
kins. And before all these he gives a notable reason for Constraint.
'For, saith he, The multitude of people amongst us are like Wax, Id. *Galat.* 1.
'and are fit to take the stamp and impression of any Religion; and 6, 7.
'it is the Law of the Land, that makes most receive the Gospel, and
'not Conscience. And as he brings a reason here for constraint, so
doth he else where remove an Objection commonly brought against
it; which is this, 'It may be said, that Faith and Conscience are Id. *Galat.* 5.
'free. I answer (saith he) though Faith in the heart, and Consci- 15.
'ence be free in respect of mans authority, yet is not the publishing
'of Faith and Profession of Conscience free in like sort, but it
'stands subject to the power of the Magistrate.

But it is time now to descend yet lower to the Doctrine of such who were of the same Confederacy with the present suers for liberty. In the year of our Lord 1641. Mr. *Marshal* preached his famous piece on *Numbers* 23. 5. of, *Curse ye Meroz*; which is nothing less than Toleration of tender Consciences (if it be lawful to suppose any conscience can be tender which differs from them) but drives on with a fury them who were not backward to oppress men in their Consciences and Religion. Amongst other things this he leaves with his Auditors, coming to Application, that being obliged to curse their Adversaries, this Cursing consisted in two things, *Male-dicere Verbo*, and *Malefacere Re*. They were to curse or speak evil of them in Word. And they were to do them mischief in Deed. Mr. *Marshal* his Sermon before the House, 1641.

Mr. *Faircloth*, preaching in the same year against *Achans* Villany, and *Josuah's* zeal against him, declares much against the *Achans* that hindered the intended Reformation, and the toleration of the Church-party, yea, against Procrastination of Severities against them; *pag.* 37. *Doct.* 4. And *pag.* 40, 41. he answereth the argument of delay taken from *Fabius Maximus*, with Application, 1. of Praise. 2. of Prayer. Then comes he to Motives: It is *pag.* 44, 45. *Sam. Faircloth* Sermon before the House of Commons, *Apr.* 4. 1641.

pag. 49. God's will, you make ſpeed. 2. *Achan* make ſpeed to do hurt. 3. Delay hinders the joy and jubilee of the Church. 4. Ye ſhall pag. 50, 51. bring bleſſings to your ſelves. 5. Juſtice executed on them, is the only end of all your Prayers. Thus he. Now if they by an uſurped authority acting, taught ſuch zeal againſt their Superiors; can they hold it unreaſonable that Legal authority ſhould proceed according to their own Maxims? But I ſhall not need to repeat innumerable inſtances which might be given of their impatience at the name of Toleration or Moderation, which they were wont to brand with the note of Deteſtable Neutrality. What was that language or deſign which *Cartwright* of old taught our late ſticklers, but a thorow Reformation? and how did he, and they after him, propound the examples of *Ezechiah*, *Joſiah*, and *Jehoſhaphat*, for that they made whole and thorow-*Reformation*, *&c.* and is there any amongſt them, or us, ſo ignorant that knows not what they meant by thorow-Reformation? and that in truth, as their Covenants and Actions demonſtrated, was nothing elſe but the utter exſtirpation of the eſtabliſhed Government and ſubverſion of the Church then, and ſo conſtituted: But peradventure they would now for peace ſake (and ſo ought we to) divide and ſhare alike. I know this is the tale they have got at their tongues end now a days, whereby they procure the eſteem by ſome, of Moderate Men. But is this with any ſerious or diſcerning man a tolerable argument for them, when as never were there any perſons ſo violent, rank, or extream in their principles but when they found it not poſſible to obtain what their principles, and deſign impell them to contend for, ſeem at leaſt ſatisfied with ſo much as they can get, though they will no longer reſt ſo than advantage ſhall carry them further. But let us hear what Mr. *Cartwright* ſpake, when the Faction was low, againſt ſuch a peace as now is preferred to us: And you may not only read the ſame deſign, but words and arguments exactly in theſe more modern Reformers, which Mr. *Cartwright* had, and the ſame ſpirit acting both him and theſe, 'Peace '(ſaith he) is commended to us with theſe conditions. [If it be poſ-'ſible, if it lies in us.] Now it is not poſſible it lieth not in us, to 'conceal the truth; we can do nothing againſt it, but for it. It is a prophane ſaying of a prophane man, That *an unjuſt peace* is better *than a juſt war*? Who ſees not from hence moſt plainly, that nothing but every thing will ſatisfie theſe men? And do they not hold

Cartwright Preface to his Reply.

Cartwright Preface to his Reply.

that

that an unjuſt peace, whereby they are kept in quiet without their diſcipline? and is not that a juſt War which is made for its ſake? More a great deal (all know) might be added againſt them from their own mouths and hands; he that ſtill doubts may look into that Treatiſe called *Evangelium Armatum*; which, though an imperfect, and indeed an abortive piece in compariſon of what was due to ſuch a ſubject, yet doth ſufficiently declare their tempers and conſtitutions to be againſt all mediocrity or compounding of Differences. I have not touched any thing therein; nor is that famous Mr. *Love* the Presbyterian *Martyr* there mentioned (as I remember) or at leaſt, not his Ranting and Railings at the attempted or pretended accommodation to be made by the Presbyterian Faction at *Uxbridg*, with the King; nor his Sermon at *Windſor*, where, in the flame of his zeal for the Cauſe, he exhorted the people to ſell their Bibles, and buy Muskets to fight againſt the King, and being (as he ſuppoſed) lead to it by his Text, ſpake thus, That if God ſhould go before the King's Party, He ſhould be the greateſt ſinner upon Earth: which paſſage ſo exorbitant being heard and excepted againſt by one of the Church of *England*, he was called to account for ſpeaking irreverently of Mr. *Love*, before the Governour of *Windſor* Caſtle; but publickly affirming and proving the ſame to be as he reported, by appeal to many Auditors of his, then preſent, who could not deny they heard the words; he was rebuked for not making the beſt conſtruction of what godly men taught. The ſame Mr. *Love* (ſo pacifick and charitable a ſpirit are they acted by) mounting the Scaffold at the Execution of the moſt Reverend Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, put to death to ſatiate the *Scots* appetite, and ſuch as ſymbolize with them, after Prelatical blood, with greateſt exſultation ſpringing at the ſight, utter'd theſe words, Art thou come Little *Will*? I am glad to ſee thee here, and hope to ſee the reſt of the Biſhops here e're long: And that moſt innocent blood being ſhed on the Stage at his beheading, he took out his Handkerchief and ſtained it therewith; and the Murther being over he rode with it to *Uxbridg*, and drawing it forth in the preſence of divers perſons ſpake thus moſt triumphantly, Here is the blood of that proud Prelate, I hope for more of their bloods e're long. Which Mr. *A. F.* Commiſſary to the Earl of *Eſſex* hearing, ſaid to ſome then preſent, and divers elſewhere afterwards before his death; that he could not believe ſuch a bloody man would

die in his bed. And ſo by the ſtrange and juſt hand of Providence it came to paſs, himſelf ſuffered in the very ſame manner that he had rejoyced to ſee in others. But yet becauſe he made uſe of the King's name to advance his Presbytery from *Scotland* into *England*, this muſt be ſet on the ſcore as an high inſtance to prove, what good Subjects Presbyterians can be, when their Diſcipline requires it.

But paſſing ſimple authorities and teſtimonies of Puritans againſt themſelves pleading for Toleration, we may come to a further double ſelf-condemnation of them. And to this end I might inſert here what hath been ſo lately reprinted and publiſhed of the Presbyterian Brethren of Sion-Colledg, or Miniſters of the City of *London*, to their Brethren of the Synod then at *Weſtminſter*, againſt Toleration of *Independents*. Which is ſo pregnant and cutting a way of arguing againſt them, that I know not what poſſibly can be urged more juſtly and reaſonably by us, or leſs anſwered by them. For, I think they will bluſh (who have not forſworn it) to ſay, we have any greater or better grounds to tolerate them, than they the Independents. For my part, I could never underſtand they had any Authority over theſe, or the ſeparation of Independents from Presbytery was ever any more a Schiſm than the Presbyterians oppoſition to, or ſeparation from, the Independents. For, though both of them (I mean ſome of both Parties) might be ſaid in ſome ſenſe to be of a Church, neither of them were ever a true Church, as bungled and patched together by their novel imaginations. Yet ſuch was the jealouſie and emulation of Presbyterians, that they would by no means have any co-ordinate Faction with their own, ſuffered.

A Letter of the Miniſters of *London*, from *Sion-Colledg* to the Synod of Divines againſt Toleration, Printed.

I had once therefore determined, to the end that all the World, and eſpecially themſelves, might ſtand convicted of the unreaſonableneſs of their demands and expectations at preſent, to give the ſum of their arguments; but conſidering how ſmall a Treatiſe that is, and how lately it is come forth, I ſhall preſume that it is already well known. And I ſhall only give the ſum of Mr. *Edwards* Reaſons, famous for his Pieces called the *Gangreen*, wherein he argues ſtrenuouſly againſt the Toleration of *Independents* then, and of his own Party now. To prove this then more methodically and ſtrongly, he lays theſe two general grounds againſt Toleration. Firſt, ſays he, Apoſtolical Practice is againſt this. Secondly, It cauſes men to run into the Violation of the conſtant

Edwards his Reaſons againſt Toleration, *Anno* 1641.

conſtant practiſe and example of the Church, during all the time of the Apoſtles: and puts Churches upon practiſes that are abſurd, and unreaſonable, and prejudicial to the good of Souls; That Government that is not of Divine Inſtitution, is not to be received: But the *Independent* doth ſo, ſaith Mr. *Edwards*, and we much more juſtly, But the *Presbyterian* doth ſo. And we prove it by Mr. *Edwards* his words following, *They force men to have Miniſters and Officers without being Ordained, contrary to the practice of the Churches all along the New Teſtament: as* Act. 6. v. 6. Act. 4. 23. *No man being Ordained Officer of the Church, without Ordination: Let them produce one Inſtance if they can.* Thus Mr. *Edwards*: Now, Mr. *Edwards* being dead, I in his ſtead challenge any, yea, all the *Presbyterians*, to give one Inſtance thorow all the Old, or New-Teſtament, or the whole Church of God for 1500 years ſince the Incarnation, that a naked *Presbyter*, or *Prieſt*, ever Ordained, or, if by higheſt Uſurpation, they did attempt ſuch a thing at any time, ſuch Ordination was ever accepted, or held good by the Church. But I deſire they would find ſome better ground to prove this, than the Identity of Biſhop and *Presbyter* anciently: For Firſt, this is no leſs doubted of, than that they would prove by it. Secondly, If becauſe St. *Hierome* is thought to have been of that Opinion, (as ſome take his words) we ſhould ſuppoſe, and not grant, that they were ſo once, it proves nothing now: when it is moſt certain they are not ſo, nor have been ſo, for many hundred years. And therefore men and women both, impoſing hands upon their Paſtor among *Independents*, if the Ordination of theſe be condemned by *Presbyterians*, the *Presbyterians* Ordination may altogether be of no account among us. *Pag.* 3. 4.

After this Mr. *Edwards* proceeds to prove particularly, That Toleration is not to be allowed: And Firſt, from the Vanity and Impertinency of the texts of Scripture brought to prove it. "For though (ſaith he) the Scripture ſpeaks much for Tolera-"ting and bearing one with another in many things, both in mat-"ters of Opinion and Practiſe, as theſe places teſtifie, *Rom.* 14. "1, 2, 3, 5, 13, 14, *v. Rom.* 15. 1, 2, 7. *Epheſ.* 4, 23. *Philip.* "3. *v.* 15, 16. Yet, when differences come either to *Hereſie* or "*Schiſm*, and Points to be maintaind by men, ſo as to trouble and "diſturb *Edwards*. ibid.

"disturb the Church, then the Scriptures are expreſs againſt "their Toleration and ſufferance, requiring them who have Pow-"er, to hinder it, as may be ſeen, *Revel.* 2. 20. *Titus.* 1. *v.* 10. "*Tit.* 3. 10. *Galat.* 5. *v.* 10, 12. and ſo on. And are not the differences now among us come already to *Schiſmatical* and *Sedi-tious Diviſions* amongſt us, ? are they then any longer to be Tole-rated? Or were theſe and the following Reaſons, only intended for the uſe of *Presbytery*, but muſt loſe all their vertue and validi-ty, when that is the Caſe againſt which they make directly ?

Secondly, he at the ſame time anſwers a Principal argument now in great uſe; and confirms his Theſis thus. "The Tolera-"tion deſired will not help to heal the *Schiſms* and Rents of this "Church, but will much foment and encreaſe them. For whileſt "ſome Congregations, and they accounted of note both for Mi-"niſters and People, will not ſubmit to the Reformation, and "Government ſetled by Law; this will breed in the Peoples "minds many thoughts *ex naturâ rei*, that this Church is not ſet-"led according to the word of God, and is unlawful, &c. Rea-"ſons hereof follow.

3. "This Toleration will not only breed Diviſions and Schiſms "diſturbing the Peace of Churches and Towns, by ſetting them "who are of different Families, and more remote Relations, one "againſt another; but it will undoubtedly cauſe much Diſtur-"bance, Diſcontents, and Diviſions between the neareſt Relations "of Husbands and Wives, Fathers and Children, Brothers and "Siſters, Maſters and Servants; the Husband being of one "Church, and the Wife of another, *&c.*

"4. There will be great danger of continual Diviſions, "Diſtractions, and Diſputes among us, not only from the Diffe-"rent Form of Government and Worſhip in their Churches and "ours; but from other Doctrines and Practiſes held by ſome of "them for the preſent.

5. "The moſt eminent Miniſters of this Kingdom for grace, "parts, and labours, can have little aſſurance of the continuance "of their Flocks to them, if ſuch a Toleration be granted; For "they will draw away their People and admit them into their "Churches, and even gather and encreaſe their Churches out "of the labours of the beſt Miniſters, *&c.*

6. "It

6. "It will be, undoubtedly, a means and way of their infinite "Multiplication and Encreaſe; even to encreaſe them thirty "Fold.

7. "The prime and Fundamental Principles of this *Independent* "(and likewiſe *Presbyterian*) way, upon which they erect their "Church-way, are very prejudicial and dangerous, and unſuffe- "rable to this Kingdom.

8. "Theſe *Independents*, (and much more *Presbyterian*) men "where they have power, would not give a Toleration for any "other *Eccleſiaſtical* Government, or Churches but in their own "way: They would not ſuffer men of other Opinions in "Doctrine and Government, to live within the bounds of their "Patent, though at the fartheſt bounds, but have Baniſhed "them, *&c.*

9. "A Toleration may be demanded upon the ſame grounds "for all the rigid *Browniſts* of the Kingdom, and for all *Ana-* "*baptiſts*, *Familiſts*, and other *Sectaries*, who profeſs this Conſci- "ence in them.

And thus you have the Heads of the *Presbyterian* Reaſons in the Words of Mr. *Edwards*: which if they may not be more ſtrongly turned againſt themſelves, now moving for Toleration, I muſt profeſs my ſelf to underſtand neither Them, nor their Logick, nor the *Engliſh* Tongue. And if men will ſtill perſiſt in their unſeaſonable, unreaſonable, and unconſcionable demands againſt all theſe ſo irrefragable Arguments to the contrary; we have nothing left but our Prayers, Tears, and Confuſion, which our notorious Flagrant Sins have brought upon us: And if Authority deſerts us with ſuch advantages on our ſides, as nothing on Earth can miniſter greater, nor any Equal Judg require better; we ſhall eaſily ſee from whence this Judgment comes, and why, (not for any wrong in this Caſe done to our Antagoniſts) *viz.* becauſe we have ſinned, and are come down wonderfully.

I might here conclude all, but that, as I have diſputed againſt them out of their own mouths and books; ſo I judg it not impertinent to ſhow the inſufficiency of their reaſons from their anſwers, or ſuch as they are not wont to queſtion, unleſs when they

they are to express. And having by the way answered some already; one or two, may suffice to be here touched.

CHAP. VIII.

Certain Exceptions, which may be made by Puritans *against what hath been delivered, answered.*

WE have already prevented the vulgar, and general Refuges, made by ignorant and undiscerning men against the way of our Church, and in behalf of their Discipline, taken from the mis-understanding of Tyranny, Extreams, Moderation, and Christian Liberty: with which Notions, Seducers are wont to make a great show amongst well-affected, but ill-advised People. We have likewise even now answered that which they offer to the People plausibly in most of their late books, though heretoforewe could never wring a syllable from them to that purpose, from the great benefit of the Peace of the Church; out of Mr. *Cartwright* and Mr. *Edwards*. And that Objection is likewise removed by Mr. *Perkins* most clearly, which urges us, that Conscience is Free and cannot be forced. So that there appears not much to remain behind, alledged by them, deserving further answer. Yet two, or three things we shall add out of them, to the former; and so end.

And First, I fore see it may be Excepted, that our discourse generally runs against grievous *Hereticks*, where we shew the Judgment and Practise of the ancient Church against them, which will not hold against those of our days and Church, who are no *Hereticks*. To which I thus answer:

First, That according to the sense of the Code, the Laws made against *Hereticks* do comprehend *Schismaticks*, and such as differ from the Church in lesser and lighter matters. *Hæreticorum autem vocabulo continentur, & latis adversus eos sanctionibus succumbere debent, qui vel levi argumento a judicio Catholicæ Religionis & tramite directi fuerint deviare.* i. e. "Under the name of "Hereticks,

" *Hereticks, are comprehended, and ought to be punished by the Sanctions made against them, all such as are found to swerve in a light matter from the judgment, and path of Catholick Religion.* Secondly, They themselves, (as appears plainly by Mr. *Edwards* his Reasons) will no more suffer *Schismaticks*, (no not their brethren the *Independents*, whom they dare not call *Hereticks*, and who had deserved so well at their hands, (which as yet they never did at ours) than *Hereticks*. 3*ly*, The practise of the ancient Church as in part we have shewed, did alwaies persecute *Schismaticks* as well as *Hereticks*. 4*ly*, The Pleas and Excuse of our Dissenters are not so allowable in the principle point of *Heresie*, as are most *Hereticks*. For, there being two Essential parts of *Heresie* generally received, A Formal part, consisting in the pravity of the mind, and disposition of the heart, and obstinacy of the will; And a Material part, consisting in the Errour it self maintained: Men of our Age and Countrey, have more of the Formality of *Hereticks*, than they who are direct *Hereticks*: Forasmuch as an *Heretick* erring in Articles of Faith, may be truly said, and allowed to make a conscience of what he (though Erroniously) believes: for being matters of Faith, they are proper Objects of Conscience, whose Sphere is good, and Evil. But they who do not differ, nor dissent (as they say) in Matters of Faith from the Church, but yet keep themselves at a distance from the Autority of the same, may indeed (whether we will or no) call their dissenting by the name of Conscience; but it is well known in reason, or propriety of speech, it cannot be so termed; when there not so much as appears Good, or Evil, in the thing it self: And therefore it must of necessity be Resolution not to agree or yield, and that is nothing else but obstinacy, as their own justifications do imply, when, being demanded, why they cannot in Conscience comply? They (to my knowledge) answer, They cannot do it. Fifthly, As Mr. *Edwards* said against the *Independents*, we may say against the *Presbyterians*, viz. That we know not the bottom of their Reformation, nor where it will end, nor what it doth hold, notwithstanding their published Confessions, and Catechisms Larger, or Lesser; there being infinite Points, which, like obstructions to a man travailing by Mapps when they shall come to put in practice, will arise unexpectedly. And besides Mr. *Cartwright*, whom they follow as their Modern Apo-

Cartwright's Reply to Bishop *Whitgift*, pag. 5.

stle, tells us in their stead, *Certain of the things we stand upon are such, that if every hair of our head were a life, we ought to afford them for the defence of them.* Again, in the same Treatise he reproveth Bishop *Whitgift* for distinguishing between matters of Faith and necessary to Salvation; and Ceremonies Orders and Discipline of the Church; as though (saith he) matters of Discipline and kind of Government were not matters necessary to Salvation and of Faith. Are these men understood, or to be trusted, when they say, they demand only such things as we may easily grant? Will they lay down their lives for them?

Id. pag. 14. And Reply to the Answer, pag. 1.

Secondly, They profess that they are ready to come up to us, if we would grant certain light matters.

But with what truth and sincerity let their Actions all along speak, which aimed at nothing less than the ruin and absolute dissolution of our Church. And let *Thomas Cartwright* in the next place tell us in these words, *Indeed it were more safe for us to conform our indiff rent Ceremonies to the Turks which are far off, than to the Papists which are so near.* And we well know how altogether Popish we are in our Ceremonies, according to their opinion. And we being as near their Discipline, as they are to our Ceremonies, and Government, may we not as well say, Indeed it were more safe for us to conform our indifferent Ceremonies to the Heathens, than to the Disciplinarians, which are so near? And thus ye see, how, according to their principles we are like to come to a good agreement, and an happy composure, as when they would smooth over the matter they dissemblingly speak, calling small and new Acquisitions, Moderation.

Id. Reply pag. 102.

Thirdly, They say, that Indifferent things ought to remain so, and they ought not to be obliged any further than Christ and the Scripture binds them.

The first part of this argument is as false, dangerous and pernicious to all Churches and all Ecclesiastical Authority, as the wit of man can invent any thing; and is quite contrary to Scriptures, which require obedience (as likewise themselves do being in power) to Superiors. And therefore to deny Superiors that wherein only their power is seen and exercised, is to take away what the Scripture grants them. Now to the second part. Christ and the Scripture oblige men to be subject in such cases to men: And *Calvin* expressly saith, *Improbare quod nunquam improbavit Deus, nimia est hominis inquam mortali temeritatis & arrogantia: Hoc autem perpetuò teneamus, usurpari,*

Calvinus Adversus *Anaba.* pag. 27. 2. in octavo.

usurpari, &c. *i. e.* "To condemn that which God never Con-"demned, is too great rashness and arrogance for Mortal man. "But let us hold to this constantly, that the autority of God is "usurped, when that which he hath permitted is condemned. And show where God hath not permitted any one of our Rites, or Ceremonies. And if ye cannor (as we are sure you cannot;) How do ye not take Gods Office out of his hands in condemning that he hath not, being all Private men, and of no autority over us? To this, let us add Mr. *Perkins* speaking thus, *Things are not called Indifferent, because we may use them indifferently, or not use them, when we will, and how we will: but because in themselves, or in their own nature they are neither good, nor evil; and we may again not use them well, or ill: Furthermore, there are two things which Restrain the use of things Indifferent, The Law of Charity, and the Laws of Men, &c.* And the same Author in another place saith, *Actions Indifferent in the case of Offence, or Edification, cease to be Indifferent, and come under some Commandment of the Moral Law.* In which, St. *Paul* saith, *If eating Flesh will Offend.* &c. Thus he. Now eating Flesh doth offend at some times, and that not equals, of whom St. *Paul* speaks, but Superiours; And a man would think, that a Sincere Conscience ought to have greater regard to these, than to other persons. And yet we find true what *Calvin* laught at in his daies thus, "You may see some, who imagine their Liberty cannot "hold, unless by eating Flesh on *Fridays*, they stand possessed of it.

Perkins on *Galat.* 2. v. 3.

Perkins Cases of Conscience. *Lib.* 1. *Chap.* 5.

Calvin. Institut. *Lib.* 3. *Cap.* 9.

Lastly, because they see their own acts to testifie so expresly against Toleration, in raising and acting one of the most sad and unjust Tragedies that ever *England* felt, and groaned under; and this principally to introduce a strange Worship, contrary to the Laws, and Consciences of so many Thousands, and their Superiours, it not being possible to shake this off them, some of them shift thus, away: That if they did evil, we ought not to do so too. For though the matter be so gross, that for arguments sake they do seem outwardly to relent, and recede from their injustice, and rigour, to the end, they may with more confidence demand favour at our hands, to whom they could do no justice; yet in truth they repent of nothing so much, as that they did not use greater extremities towards us, appears by their reserving to themselves, all true signs and effects of true Repentance: For to one another or to the People, whom they have grossly misled so far, that it is

frequent with them to say, that they could conform, but that they have taught the People otherwise, (an imprudent, as well as an ungodly evasion) they never make any such acknowledgement: But whereas they, upon the nature of true Repentance, are obliged to do their plain and utmost indeavours to undeceive, and restore them to the truth; they on the contrary, use all subtile and secret artifices to nourish such wicked Errours as they have bred in them, while they themselvs in close discourse being expostulated with, for the occasion, will say as Mr. *Corbet* doth, There might be some excess heretofore, by the *Presbyterian* committed. But to the Point: It no ways followeth, that if the *Presbyterians* offended (and that notoriously) in Persecuting deadly the Church, therefore a retaliation of the same measure should be called (as they would have it) revenge, or be unjust. For, waving at present the differences of the Causes (which how ever equal and indifferent judges would certainly give against them) they no doubt will to the last keep up disputable) the manner of proceeding and acting make a foul difference. For there was wanting all Legal Authority both Civil and Ecclesiastical, on that side; and yet dreaded they not to impose their pleasures and Innovations both, on their brethren; who were no more subject to them, than were they to these; but also usurped over their Governours too, and brought them either to obey their Wills, or suffer their Vengeance: Which was an higher piece of iniquitie than that of the *Pope* himself. For as we of this Church were free from his power; so have we nothing to do to give law to him: But these men were in all Lawful and Canonical subjection under those they would give Law unto, as well in Reference to Conscience, as Civil propertie. Yet am I not without a Witness of their own against them, even in this Particular. For thus reasonably writes one of them. "We declare it, that it is true indeed we cannot "come up in all things to their judgment who are over us, as we "know they could not come up to ours, when we were advanced "over them. As we could not allow them any publick imploy- "ment, or encouragement, when they could not comply with us, "and our Laws, and Constitutions. So we cannot expect any pub- "lick imployment, or incouragement from them, now we Dissent "from them, and cannot close with their Laws and Constitutions, *&c.* This hath much of Ingenuity, if we compare it with the more

Corbet's Interest.

Mysteries of Godliness and Cabbala. *pag.* 2.

common

common temper of them, which leads them only to take away Liberty from others, but to grant none. But neither muſt we ſuffer this conceſſion to paſs without Cenſure. For according to their common and current Craft with the Ignorant, fain they would ſhuffle and confound all Power ſo and Lawful Authority, as that theirs it ſhould fairly and fully be, who can lay hold of it by Injuſtice, and retain it by Violence: And therefore becauſe once indeed by ſpoil and rapine, they poſſeſſed themſelves of Power in Church and State; do they compare themſelves with ſuch, upon whom it deſcends fairly and orderly, by the received courſe of known Juſtice and Religion. But grant them this, we grant them almoſt all: But they muſt know, there is an infinite diſparity, which they can never remove, though they have put fair for it, ſome of them in reſolving, Firſt, all Civil-Power, and next, with little more infatuation and boldneſs, all Eccleſiaſtical Government into the power of the People; and the power of the People, into the power of the Sword. So that Perſon, or thoſe ſhould be unqueſtionably veſted in Civil Dominion, and that Society rightly conſtituted in Eccleſiaſtical Rule, who have invaded the ſame, and are able to hold it: A Tenet of which I ſhall ſpeak no more at preſent than I have already, only that God would give us if not Grace, human Prudence, and reaſon ſo far to judg of, as may draw us to lament and prevent by humble Suits the unavoidable Diſaſters and Confuſions it muſt again cover the face of that Earth with where it abides; And that God would reſtore ſo much of loſt man in us, before we pretend to be Chriſtians (and that of the beſt ſort) as to ſtand to our own Judgments and not to alter and vary according to our advantage, and neceſſities of our eſpouſed Intereſts; producing quarrels and babbles to Eternity it ſelf, if we could live ſo long; as they certainly would, who will neither yield to Reaſon, nor ſuffer their own Rules and Opinions to take place in them, ſo as to reduce them to order.

But the ſolemn and indiſſoluble band of their League and Covenant caſt upon themſelves and others in authority, muſt by no means be violated; and beſides, ſome Poſteriorities are pretended & urged to the great advantage of the Diſcipline, and theſe ariſing from promiſes made of having regard to tender Conſciences upon the entrance of his Majeſty into his Throne, and ſome Diſciplinarians great merits.

To the firſt part of theſe, it may be reaſonably demanded, What

that

that ſtrange ſacredneſs is, what unheard-of Excellency it hath, and new divineneſs that neither any Oaths or Obligations, wherewith men were bound before, nor any which they have ſince regularly taken, ſhould be of any force or vertue at all againſt the Covenant? But what ever went before, is made void by the Covenant, what ever follows is made abortive by the Covenant. How comes this about? Was the authority of the Inventers, or the juſt power of the propounders, or the divineneſs and ſacredneſs of the matter ſuch that this, and none but this, muſt be of any validity or worth with us? Nothing leſs ſure: For, all theſe are unanſw. Arg. againſt it; for, neither circumſtance, nor ſubſtance was either legal, or juſt, or holy; as may appear from the infinite falſifications, direct falſities both as to Hiſtory and Reaſon, with which that Treatiſe is fraught to juſtifieit, and confirm men of little conſcience and judgment, in that bond of Iniquity.

The Covenants Plea againſt Abſolvers.

But let their great Caſuiſt *Alexander Hinderſon* be here admitted to ſpeak, and how eaſie will it be to reſolve this doubt? That King of Bleſſed Memory to whom he wrote, to his own confuſion; objecting againſt his New Oath the Covenant, his old Oaths taken directly to the contrary at his Coronation, was then anſwered that the Parliament and people to whom they were made, might free him from ſuch engagements, (not that the King ever made ſuch Oaths otherwiſe to Parliaments in his ſenſe, but as they are the Peoples Repreſentatives.) Which though as the King ſolidly replies, is a falſe Suppoſition, yet hereby are evident the principles of ſuch Doctors, that Parliaments may lawfully quit the Prince of Oaths taken in reference to the People. Therefore, according to them, the perfect Parliament having not only declared againſt ſuch Obligations, but by ſtrong reaſons manifeſted the nullity of them; what pretence can they have who are, and always were, but private men in ſuch caſes to urge their *Soveraign* with ſuch burdens & bonds?

But further, The pretended promiſe was made to tender Conſciences, and how doth it appear that the Presbyterians are comprehended under that expreſſion? We abſolutely deny the ſame. And what force can their bare Aſſertions and Teſtimonies given of themſelves be to prove it; when we have ſuch ſtore of Inſtances of matter of Fact which no men of good Conſcience, much leſs tender in the received ſenſe, can willingly commit, and much leſs perſevere to juſtifie? But if it muſt be ſo, that ſuch a ſenſe of tenderneſs of Conſcience muſt needs be true becauſe 'tis common and current, How will they not in opening that door for themſelves let in ſuch a

Rabble

Rabble as they ſhall have but little joy in their poſſeſſions? Will they multiply beggarly proofs, and ſay, They are a ſober, a godly, a moderate party; and ſo conclude juſt as much as they did before?

To ſhut up all, ſome there are who diſtinguiſh of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks. For, they are (ſay they) either peaceable, or unquiet and ſeditious: The ſeditious and unquiet Heretick or Schiſmatick (according to theſe) may not be ſuffered, but the modeſt, and ſober, and peaceable ought to be born with; and this is *Mentzerus* his deciſion; and the Plea of both Papiſt and Puritan with us at preſent. For now forſooth, *No ſuch good Subjects as Catholicks.* And the *Anabaptiſt* himſelf writes at large, *Saints no Smiters.* And now go round about, enter into the midſt of all that have been bitter Enemies to the King, and you muſt have as rare luck as he that draws a Prize at a Lottery, if you can pick out a diſloyal ſubject; in diſcourſe, All Factions contend which ſhould pretend moſt Loyalty.

Mentzerus in *Exegeſi Auguſtanæ Confeſſ. Art.* 10.

Thomb's Saints no Smiters.

But in anſwer to this diſtinction, we ſhall crave leave in like manner to diſtinguiſh of Rooks: for, ſome Rooks ſet upon trees, and they pick not up the new-ſown Corn, and therefore may be born with, and not moleſted; and ſome Rooks ſet upon Lands, and they are not to be ſuffered, for they do hurt to Corn. Juſt ſuch an one, and ſo to be favoured is the Heretick and Schiſmatick. I confeſs, the diſtinction had been tolerable, had it been made of the Abſtracts, *Schiſms* and *Hereſies.* For true it may be, that ſome of both ſorts contain nothing in them turbulent or ſeditious. But to take this in the Concrete, Schiſmaticks and Hereticks, is no leſs ridiculous than we have made; and no leſs falſly ſuppoſed of them who at preſent put it into their Pleas than of any other. Are not they, think we, of a very gentle, quiet, and peaceable Nature and Diſpoſition who being in power (not elſe you may be ſure) in purſuance of their Schiſm, turned out of their Livings but 85 Miniſters of the 97 Pariſhes within the Walls of *London*, whereof 16. died with ſorrow, and 14 out of the 16. Pariſhes, without the Walls; and out of the 10. Out-Pariſhes 9; and ſo proportionably where they were Maſters; eſpecially while they retain the very ſame Principles, whereby they ſo acted: *Pliny* tells us that the Lion as fierce a beaſt as it is, may be made very gentle and tame by ſevere and ſeaſonable treatments, ſo that one may ſuffer it to lick his very fleſh; but his tongue being very rough, if in fawning and licking he chances to draw the leaſt blood from a man, together with its ſlaver, he is ſo raviſht with the ſavorineſs of it, that he is put into rage & fury. So in truth, no queſtion but the fierceſt *Sciſmatick* or *Heretick* may be brought

Plin. Natur. Hiſt. lib. 11. *cap.* 37.

brought to a very gentle and familiar condition; but suffer him to have such neer access to Majesty, as to but taste the infinite sweets of Power, and Rule; through a secure confidence in his general Innocency, so transported is he beyond his own ordinary, yet unnatural and forced temper, that his Ingenuity will soon end in injustice, and his fairness in fury: And then shall you beg Toleration of him, and be sure to go without it and that deservedly.

Some there are of no mean place and policie, who advise seriously, to avoid the Infamy of Persecuting poor Souls for Religion, and let them be Executioners of their own Mischief and Ruine: For (say they) Let them (for instance the *Quakers*) alone, and in time they will certainly destroy one another. Which I may easily grant to be true, and yet the Counsel very weak, and unreasonable. For 'tis true, that many Religions shall I call them, or superstitions rather, now pleading for Toleration, would in their progress fall foul with themselves, and they devoted to them confound one another. And it is most probable, if Wild-Beasts were set at liberty from their Pens into some open place they would tear and worrey one another to Piece, but not till they had put to flight, or devoured their Keepers. It is very likely, that *Phanaticks*, and *Schismaticks* of the same Denomination, would in time fight out the truth of Religion amongst them; but their Common Enemy (as they call us) must first lye gasping at their Feet. And will it not be a notable Solace to a wise man to foresee, that by casting away his own life for nothing, preparation will be made to destroy his Adversary? such is the safety in many Religions.

The Decencie (to all sober Christians) is answerable to the safety. For, as *Lucian* tells how *Ptolemie* Son of *Lagus* King of *Egypt* presented to his People a Black Camel for a Show, a thing, where those Beasts abound most, never seen; and a Man one half of whom was perfect Black, and the other half of his Body very Fair. At the Camel they all stood amazed: but at the Man, most of the beholders burst out into a loud laughter; others in scorn and detestation turned away from such a ridiculous Monster, and reproach to mankind: and yet this person differed not from other men, as to parts, or substance, but Ceremonie only, and Accidents. So what ever may be Tolerated, and perhaps Admired in matters not of Divine concernment and nature in Religion to exhibit a Church to Christian spectators so most strangly divided and dissonant to it self, though but in things, not Essential or Substantial to Faith, but circumstances, is to render it ridiculous to one half of the World, the merry sort; and to the other sort, the sober and judicious, odious, and so Scandalous, that few of these will ever yield to become *Proselytes* to it, or tarry with it long. And we may be sure, that they whose Policy, rather than Piety, or Prudence incline them to favour such Monstrosities, have nothing so much in their design, as to have us laughed out of the present Religion, and to make way for No Religion or for another Religion. For to encounter either of which nothing can be more profitable than by a generous Constancy, to follow and persevere in our own Religion: For then will the slie underminer of it find himself in the end baffled, the impudent opposer ashamed, and the witty scoffer, ridiculous to himself, having nothing else to bear him out but boldness, and multitude of Offenders.

FINIS.

132655